SEX MORALITY

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

BY

WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M.D.
LEO JACOBI, M.D.

JAMES P. WARBASSE, M.D.
EDWIN C. WALKER
JAMES F. MORTON, JR., M.A.
B. S. TALMEY, M.D.
MAUDE GLASGOW, M.D.

No book has a right to exist that has not for its purpose the betterment of mankind, by affording either useful instruction or healthful recreation. —*W. J. R.*

SECOND EDITION

1919
THE CRITIC AND GUIDE COMPANY
12 Mt. Morris Park West
NEW YORK

GENERAL PREFACE

I believe that this symposium on sex morality is unique in the English language. It should help to a clarification of our views and opinions on this extremely vital subject.

It is interesting to note that while all the men contributors to the symposium belong to the class of radicals and free thinkers, and hold advanced views on politics, religion, and social economics, their ideas on sex morality are far from being identical. In fact, on *one* point—that of sexual abstinence or "illicit" sexual relations—the contributors express diametrically opposite views. It is probably true that many years will pass before we will attain unanimity on the sex question. In the meantime we must think, study, investigate; think, study, investigate; and

again think, study and investigate. And we must do it without fear or mental reservation.

W. J. R.

CONTENTS

SPECIAL PREFACE

"In the matter of public writing and speaking I listen to no remonstrance, I acknowledge no decision, save that of the divine monitor within me. My conscience is my adviser, my audience and my judge. It bids me write and speak as I write and speak, without evasion, without disguise; it bids me to go on as I have begun, whatever the result may be. If my opinions should be condemned, without a single exception, by every one of my readers, it will not make me regret having expressed them, and it will not prevent me from expressing them again. It is my earnest and sincere conviction that those opinions are not only true, but also that they tend to elevate and purify the mind. One thing, at all events, I know: that it has done me good to write this

essay; and therefore I do not think that it can injure those by whom it will be read."

The above is a paraphrase of some sentences from Winwood Reade's preface to his "Martyrdom of Man." I always loved that passage, and I take it as my own to serve as a preface to my essay on Sex Morality.

It will be noticed that in the entire paper I have not referred to venereal disease as a factor in or cause for sex morality. To do so seems to me to confuse the issue. To preach continence because non-continence may lead to venereal infection is not a moral argument. Burglary is wrong irrespective of whether the burglar gets or does not get caught. If illicit sexual relations are wrong they are wrong irrespective of the danger of infection.

What I replied in the CRITIC AND GUIDE to a contributor who advocated

complete abstinence in the male on account of the risk of venereal infection may be repeated here:

It is the same old argument of fear, of trying to make people good by threats. "Do not steal or you may get caught and go to prison" is an argument of the same character. And supposing the man is *absolutely sure* that his female companion is perfectly healthy and pure and there is no possibility of getting any venereal disease—what argument would you use then to keep him chaste? And extending individual instances to a larger sphere, assuming that humane sanitation and the universal intelligent use of venereal prophylactics has abolished venereal disease entirely—a thing not altogether outside the bounds of possibility, or even probability—what then? Evidently, the argument, be chaste or you will catch a disease which you may transmit to your wife and children, will then not hold good.

What other argument will we then present to our boys and men?

Let us once forever bear in mind that fear and threats are losing their power as arguments. Disregarding the fact that the man who is "good" simply because he is afraid is really not moral, only a coward, people begin to find out that the threats are exaggerated and having once found it so they are apt to go to extremes, and let all caution go to the winds, thinking that the threats were just grandmother's tales in order to keep them in the straight path.

No, if a certain line of conduct is enjoined upon an advanced independent thinker, you must be able to prove to him that that line of conduct is for the benefit of the individual and of the race, that a contrary line of conduct is to the detriment of both. If you cannot prove it, you have no case.

W. J. R.

SEX MORALITY, PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M.D.

SEX MORALITY
PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

IT is unfortunately only too true that many of our opinions are influenced by our general feelings, and to a considerable extent by our physical condition. This is particularly true whenever we come to discuss questions of a sexual character. The man possessed of a very powerful sexuality will be biased in favor of a free sexual morality, may even feel nothing wrong in promiscuity, and will condone sexual freedom in others. The man of naturally weak sexuality or of an age in which the sexual desire or power is almost or quite extinct, will demand a very strict monogamic standard, and will be ruthless in denouncing any sexual transgression in others, either ante-matrimonial or extra-marital.

It can even be proven fairly conclusively that the institutions of polygamy, monogamy and polyandry were, next to economic conditions, influenced by the degree of sexual power in a given race or nation. The sexually strong tribes were polygamous, the moderately strong were almost monogamous, while in the sexually weak tribes polyandry was prevalent.

I recognize that it is extremely difficult to assume a perfectly objective attitude uncolored by our feelings. I recognize that even all our prophecies as to the future are influenced by our desires and opinions. What we *want* to take place, we believe *will* take place. The anarchist, for instance, in picturing the future state of society is sure that it will be a state without any government, without any laws, even without any rules or regulations; the state socialist is certain that the government of the future will be of

wider scope and more strongly centralized.

The atheist is *sure* that in future there will be no such thing as religion in any form, while the sincere Catholic is *absolutely certain* that Catholicism is going to spread further and further and will eventually become the only religion in the world. All the infidels, the Jews, the various Christian denominations, the Mahomedans, the Buddhists, etc., etc., will eventually come to see the truth and will become loyal members of the Catholic Church. I have met such a Catholic. Tell such a believer that the time *may* come when all dogmatic religions, including Judaism and Christianity, will disappear from the face of the earth, and he will think that you are insane.

The monogamist of the present *has no doubts* whatever that monogamy will be the state of the future, perhaps even in a stricter and more absolute form. The

free-lover smiles at this, for he *knows* that free union or even promiscuity will be the prevalent system. In short, our prophecies about the future are merely the reflections of our ideals in the present. What we believe in and what we want, that we are *sure* is going to be the prevailing system of the future.

While objectivity may perhaps be attained in discussions as to what should be the right conduct of the present, I emphasize that it is practically impossible to be strictly objective in our prophecies as to the more or less distant future. The human mind is not willing to admit that the future may be entirely different from what one *wants* it to be, from what one hopes it will be.

Recognizing these limitations of the human mind, we will try to do our best. If we cannot attain absolute objectivity, we will try to be as objective as we can.

Of all questions, the sexual question is

preëminently the question which must be discussed with absolute freedom, frankness and honesty. If it cannot be so discussed, it should be left alone altogether. Half-hearted admissions, equivocal hints and veiled allusions are useless and may prove worse than useless. For if misunderstood, they may lead, and often do lead, to wrong conclusions. It does require some courage, at the present time, to discuss the manifestations of the human sexual instinct in the same calm, unconcerned manner in which we discuss any biologic or social question, but it must be done. There is no way out of it. And we must not be afraid to go wherever investigation may lead us. There must be no shrinking back from our logical conclusions, be they what they may. Our sole criterion must be—human happiness. If we should find that absolute sexual license, that unrestricted, riotous promiscuity would best contribute toward human happiness, then

we should not be afraid to say so; and unrestricted promiscuity should be our ideal. If we think that free unions or temporary marriages or a modified monogamy will be most conducive to human happiness, we should say so; and if we find that rigid monogamy in the absolute sense of the term, without any extra-marital relations on the part of either sex, will best contribute to the happiness of mankind, or the greatest happiness of the greatest number, then we should not be afraid to say so. In short, we should not be afraid to advocate that system of sexual relations, whatever it may be, which in our opinion would contribute most to human happiness.

Whether it is due to hereditary influences or strictly orthodox early training or very early marriage or other circumstances, I cannot say; but as an ideal, as an abstract desideratum, the truly monogamic marriage appeals to me more than any other system of sexual relations. The

truly monogamic couple, where the man and the woman go chaste to the marriage bed, and go thru life in mutual love and respect, these feelings growing stronger as the years pass by, finding full satisfaction in each other, without any desire for any other man or woman—what nobler, what more appealing ideal can one conjure up? Nor is it an utterly unrealizable ideal, for the sneers of the cynics to the contrary, there are such couples, even at the present time, and even in our largest Babylons. They may not constitute a large percentage, but that they do exist and live most happily demonstrates that the ideal is not a chimera and is not altogether outside the bounds of practical realization. In my practice, to encounter a man who has had no sexual relations until his wedding night, and no extra-marital relations whatever, is not such a great rarity.

How do I know that my patients tell me

the truth, when they assure me of their strictly and exclusively marital relations? Because, I *know*. Because my patients tell me the truth. They come of their own free will and accord, they want to be helped, they know that I look at sexual matters from the same calm dispassionate viewpoint that I regard a headache, or dyspepsia, or a broken leg, they know that I am not a hypocrite or a moralist preacher, and they tell me their sexual histories with the same ease and frankness as they would the history of any of their other troubles. They do not hesitate to disclose to me their perversions—why should they lie about their normal relations before or extra-marital relations after marriage? No, I can have confidence in the statements of my patients. And I repeat, the strictly chaste and monogamic man is not such a rarity, at least in this country and in England.[1] And if

[1] I must admit however this: In Germany and

marriage could be consummated at an early age, say at the age of eighteen to twenty-two, such cases would be much more frequent. The strictly monogamic ideal, I repeat, is not an absurdity, not a chimera. And they are to be envied who can attain that ideal and live happily under it.

But that ideal is not applicable to all mankind. Many of our troubles arise from our stupid attempts to measure all men and all women by the same standard. The man with an uncontrollably powerful sexuality would like to see all restrictive laws or opinions smashed to pieces and he looks with contempt at the pious impotent weakling; the latter looks at the former

France and other continental European countries it is rather difficult to find a man who has been completely abstinent up to his wedding day. Meirowsky's recent investigations among the intellectual classes gave as the result 1 per cent. of men (to be exact 1.1 per cent.) who had had no sexual relations up to their marriage.

with hatred and would like to have him incarcerated. The moderate normal man knows that both are wrong, both abnormal, but he also knows that neither can help his opinions, for they are both influenced by their feelings, by their physical condition. An examination of a man's prostate and seminal vesicles would often shed much light on the *why* of his speaking and writing.

The strict ideal of monogamy, I said, is not applicable to all mankind. Antenuptially, for instance, it is becoming more and more difficult to live up to that ideal. It is even questionable if, with the late marriages, it is desirable that men should live up to it. And to preach at men, to insist that they should remain chaste until their marriage, when that marriage takes place when they are thirty or thirty-five years old or even older, is absurd. I am not sure that such preaching may not even be designated as criminal.

For if people really followed the advice of our moral preachers, the results would in many cases prove disastrous. And I repeat what I said so many times before: an impotent man is a more pitiable man than a venereally infected man. [For a fuller discussion of this point, see the author's "Sexual Problems of To-day," Chapter: "The Relations of the Sexes or Man's Inhumanity to Woman."]

So much for the unmarried man, the bachelor. We now come to the married man. To even venture to suggest that strict monogamy is not applicable, suitable, healthy or even possible for all men, is a risky undertaking indeed. You run the risk not only of being branded as immoral and depraved by the ignorant and well-meaning fools, who do not know, and do not wish to learn, the difference between the discussion of a thing and its advocacy, but you run a greater risk: you run the risk of having your work, to which

you have given your best and most earnest thought, declared obscene and unmailable by our ignorant and autocratic obscurantist censors, who do not know the difference between obscenity and a high class scientific discussion of a sexual subject.

But I believe the time has come to brave the misunderstandings of the stupid and the wrath of the vicious, and to tell the truth as we see it, regardless of consequences. And with the truth as our sole guide, we will say that it is impossible for some men to live a strictly monogamic life and we have therefore no right to demand of them strict compliance with a strictly monogamic standard.

A number of men complained to me bitterly and with deep self-reproach of their complete lack of *libido* or the complete *impotentia cœundi* with their wives. Of course I do not speak here of cases where the man and woman are mismated, where the woman has some disagreeable

pelvic disease, or a bad odor from the mouth, or where the man has a dislike for his wife. Such cases are so common as to be commonplace and vulgar. No, I refer to cases where the man loved his wife, loved her fully, solely and sincerely, would have suffered to the end in silence rather than to cause her any pain, would rather have castrated himself than to part from his wife—and still complained that he had neither desire for his wife nor any ability to perform the act with her. He had a desire for another woman; not any woman in particular, just a woman. And it was not viciousness on the man's part—for he fought against it, the proof of which is to be found in the fact that he came to be treated for his affliction. And with another woman he was perfectly potent. And the strangest part—strange to one who has not made a study of the subject, but not strange to him who has come in contact with a number of such cases—of

it is, that after short temporary relations with other women both the man's *potentia* and his *libido* for his wife returned with all their former, if not even with greater vigor.

Now, in a case like this, what shall we do? Shall we insist upon the man's remaining true to his marriage vows, in spite of the fact that this may lead to his and his *wife's* illness and misery, home disruption and divorce? The uncompromising moralist, who believes that man was made for morals and not morals for man, and who is in our opinion very frequently very immoral, because heartless and cruel, will answer: Yes, he dare not break his marriage vows. We will very gently whisper: Yes, he dare, and for his own and his wife's happiness, he *shall.* If the wife is wise, she will whisper this advice herself.

There is another class of cases. A man comes to us and tells us that he loves his wife, attends to his marital duties nor-

mally, his *libido* and his power are unimpaired, and still he does not feel satisfied; he feels tired after the act, and disinclined to work; the feeling of springiness and buoyancy that he used to have is entirely lacking. If he is a man doing creative work, he complains of a lack of "inspiration." And some men become actually unable to work. If they force themselves, the work is of poor quality, mechanical, artificial. A temporary change sometimes works wonders. What shall we do? Shall we sacrifice the man's work and talent at the altar of an artificial man-made morality? The answer will depend upon who the answerer is—a narrow medievalist or a modern thinker.

I will present the following propositions:

The strictly monogamic standard is not a chimera, not an abstract ideal impossible of realization in practice; it is being lived up to now, and the cases in which

it is followed are not such exceptional rarities.

Ante-nuptial chastity in man is quite feasible in a society in which marriages take place early.

Under our present economic and social conditions, when men marry at the age of thirty, thirty-five and later, chastity in men is not feasible, not advisable and probably not desirable.

We are confronted in practice with certain cases in which the man's *libido* and *potentia,* either one or both, are partially or completely lost as far as the wife is con-concerned. Their libido and potentia is normal toward other women, and a temporary change often renders their feelings normal towards their own wives. In such cases we are morally justified in recommending such a change.

There is a class of cases where the man, without losing his *libido* or *potentia*, gets a feeling of unconquerable ennui or tired-

ness or dulness, with regard to his life partner. A temporary separation or change generally effects a cure in such cases.

There are certain men doing creative work to whom an occasional new relation seems absolutely necessary, in order that they may do their best work.

There are men of powerful sexuality, whom the wife alone, tho perfectly normal, cannot fully satisfy. While normal, her sexuality is much below that of the man. What are we to do in such cases?

There are men who, on account of certain psychological peculiarities, cannot live in permanent union with any one person; are not fit to be married men. Such people live happily in temporary unions with congenial or similarly constituted women, and such temporary unions are therefore the proper thing for them.

If the above premises and theses are

correct, the following conclusions may be enunciated:

The monogamic system of marriage will probably survive in the future as the dominant system. The family will in the future, as in the present, form the basic unit of society, for a happy, harmonious family is the best environment for the proper bringing up of children, for the proper development of character. Of course it is possible that the state institutions for the care of children in the future will be of a much higher character than the institutions of the present. But the institutions with which we are familiar do not inspire us with very great expectations in this respect. A good home is superior to the best institution or asylum or *pension* or dormitory, and no substitute has yet been found for mother love and father love.

It is possible that many wives and husbands will find it more suitable to their characters to live in separate houses or

apartments. Constant co-habitation in one house is terribly wearing on the nerves of some of the most loving husbands and wives.

Whether or not the people will still solemnize their marriages with religious or legal ceremonies is a matter of minor importance. One thing is certain: marriage will not be such a practically indissoluble arrangement or contract as it is now. There isn't any question in my mind that on the petition of both parties a divorce or dissolution of marriage will be granted without further ceremony. The two persons who have to live together are the best judges as to whether they want to continue to live together or not. And when there are no children to be taken care of, a simple declaration by husband and wife, repeated perhaps after a lapse of three or six months, should be and will be quite sufficient for the termination of the marriage contract. Here the state

has nothing to say. When there are children the state will make sure that they will be properly cared for and provided for, before a divorce is granted.

Cases where only one party demands a divorce, will have to be carefully studied by a commission, which will include in its personnel physicians and psychiatrists, and every case will be decided on its merits. But adultery will certainly not be the only reason for granting a divorce, as it is in so many states now. Perhaps adultery will be considered the least important reason for the granting of a divorce. Of course, women of the future state of society being economically independent, the question of alimony will not possess the same importance that it does now. Perhaps it will not enter into the question at all.

Monogamy, while being the prevalent system, will not be surrounded with the rigid and iron-clad rules of the present

day, will not be so absolute in its applications as it is *theoretically* supposed to be now, and occasional departures from it will not be accompanied by the odium and legal punishments of the present day. The mass of the people being more familiar with the truths of physiology and psychology, occasional straying from the straight and narrow path of rigid monogamy will not be frowned upon by the wife. *Perhaps it will be encouraged by her.*

Ante-nuptially no reproach will be attached to sexual relationships. Prostitution being a coarse and unsanitary institution, relationships of a different character will come into vogue where the health of both the man and the woman will be as secure and as safeguarded as it is in the legal marriage. As no odium will be attached to such relations, no secrecy will be required and all sanitary precautions will be readily carried out, should such

sanitary precautions be needed at that time. For we believe that in the future, prostitution being non-existent and individual prophylaxis having been in use for years, venereal disease will have disappeared from the face of the earth.

It is possible that it will be considered best for people to marry at a very early age—eighteen to twenty-two—even before the man can establish and support an independent home. In such cases the young man and woman would remain at their respective parents' homes, until such a time when they could live independently, and they would meet only occasionally. They would have to guard against having children, but the measures for the prevention of conception are easily taught and easily carried out.

Men and women who, for one reason or another, will be unable or unwilling to enter into any permanent union or to have any children, will enter into free tempo-

rary unions, openly and frankly, and they will not be ostracized or even frowned upon for so doing. For it will be recognized that for some men or women it is the only form of sexual relationship possible, either psychically or physiologically.

I have spoken only of the morality of the male. Because it is his morality that presents vexing problems. Because I still maintain that the female is essentially monandrous, and if properly mated she presents no sexual problem. There is a small minority who are polyandrous in their instincts, who have unconquerable sexual passions. They will enjoy the same liberties that men do. This will also apply to unmarried women or to women who are married to impotent men. They will possess the same freedom and privileges as are now enjoyed by men *de facto* and as will be enjoyed by the men of the future state of society *de jure*.

SEX MORALITY,
PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

LEO JACOBI, M.D.

5-a

SEX MORALITY—PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

I

THE course of social evolution is not a steady, uniform onward movement, as many erroneously believe; it is rather a series of alternating phases, epochs of rapid progress succeeded by periods of comparative stagnation and even retrogression.

In this rhythmic advance, the present time exhibits all the characteristics of a positive stage. The feverish activity, the universal unrest, the searching criticism of established values, all reveal the painful process of social readjustment. Forms held in reverence a generation ago are now subjected to merciless revaluation. Religious, political, industrial institutions are thrown in the balance and

threatened with destruction or at best reconstruction.

Nor does the movement of reform spare our ethical conceptions. "Now that moral injunctions are losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin, the secularization of morals is becoming imperative," wrote Herbert Spencer barely a generation ago. Many still cling to the older forms with the grim allegiance of despair, but on all sides people are seen cutting themselves loose from the wreck and striking out for shore.

Among the problems coming under the jurisdiction of ethics, the one dealing with sex relations, always important, has in our own day assumed gigantic dimensions. From stage and from pulpit, in novels and in scientific works, in the periodical press and even in the daily papers, a lively discussion is in progress which testifies to the deep-seated vital interest in this aspect of human conduct.

Unfortunately, the utterances heard on both sides are more frequently the crude offspring of prejudice, intolerance and hypocrisy, than the expression of sound thinking and feeling. Despite the widespread conquests made by the evolutionary philosophy, we are assailed on all sides by opinions which proceed from the naïvest assumptions. People seem to have an unwavering faith in the efficiency of logical argumentation. They believe it is only necessary to demonstrate the correctness of their own attitude in order to shape the conduct of their opponents accordingly. This confidence in reasoning is exhibited by the ignorant in common with the cultured, tho surely the latter ought to realize that it is not by abstract ideas, but by sentiments, feeling, emotion, that human conduct is governed everywhere and eminently so within the sphere of sex relations. "It is never the knowledge which is the moving agent in

conduct, but it is always the feeling which goes along with that knowledge or is excited by it" (Spencer).

Despite innumerable experiences showing how people habitually act at variance with their knowledge as long as it remains a dead letter, we read and hear continually that extension of knowledge is the only means of insuring rational thinking and ethical behavior.

Now, were opinions and convictions actually based solely on logical evidence, how would it be possible for men possessing vast knowledge to profess beliefs so radically different and even mutually destructive? Having access to the same sources of information, and endowed with a trained intellect, they, nevertheless, arrive at widely divergent conclusions. With the same data before them, Prof. Lowell argues that Mars is inhabited, while the venerable Wallace demonstrates that only the earth can support life.

Pointing to the same economic facts, the republican politician advocates protective tariffs, while his democratic rival pleads for free trade. The same evils of civilization that make the anarchist denounce all authority, call forth the socialist's demand for more government.

In all these and similar instances, it is the bias of heredity and education and environment that determines the attitude. When men go to war and spill their blood in the struggle over a principle, a mere theoretical disagreement is never the moving power behind them; if lives are to be sacrificed, the profoundest sympathies must be enlisted in the cause. The same truth becomes apparent on contemplating certain other familiar occurrences. Take an orator, for example, who pleads diligently and marshals abundant evidence, yet somehow leaves us cold, while another, without any display of erudition, succeeds in carrying his audience away by the sheer

force of his aplomb. The former addresses himself to our intellect; the latter chooses the shorter route leading thru the emotions and wins. Invariably the appeal to feeling is more effective than the appeal to reason, as illustrated by the daily spectacle of eloquence overruling evidence in the courtroom and on the political platform.

This statement applies with additional force to the arguments that fly so thick in the controversy waged around the sex problem, for here, especially, is opinion and behavior based on powerful emotions and sentiments, the products of heredity, education, race and creed. Hence to dispute is merely to emphasize the hopeless incompatibility. As Spencer remarks, "in respect of private life the problems presented are so complex and so variable, that nothing like definite solutions of them can be reached by any intellectual processes, however methodic and however

careful. They can be completely solved only by the organic adjustment of constitution to condition." There is too much faith in regulating conduct by precepts. Our beliefs are not founded on conclusions built up from premises, and only when they are challenged do we fall back upon the resources of logic to support them.

Even were it possible to alter settled opinions by debating, we would still be far from influencing conduct. The gulf between preaching and practice cannot be bridged over in this way. Consistency in people's lives is proverbially rare, and perhaps this is for the best, since social stability might be endangered if all were to act in accordance with their half-baked convictions. How far afield consistency in sexual conduct practiced on a large scale may lead, can be gathered from a phenomenon which took place in Russia a few years ago, when the young students of both sexes in

colleges and universities, indignantly rejecting the unjust double standard of morality, decided to live up to their ideas. Accordingly, they organized so-called Leagues of Free Love and surrendered themselves to promiscuous relations. The consequences made their appearance very promptly, tho not in the form expected by the votaries. Instead of dealing a deathblow to conventional morals, the reformers were stricken down by venereal diseases, which spread among them like an epidemic, and this, together with numerous pregnancies in the young girls, necessitated the closing of several colleges. The whole case illustrates clearly, how unlooked for effects usurp the place of expected results, and this knowledge ought to give us pause before we proceed to shape our conduct in conformity with hasty generalizations.

The foregoing seemingly irrelevant introduction will have served a useful pur-

pose if it succeeds in impressing upon the reader that discussions of ethical matters have less value as guides to behavior than is ordinarily assumed. They are interesting and noteworthy chiefly as a barometer of the times, indicating the drift of progress, which emanates from far deeper sources than human reason.

II

The current debates about sexual matters are devoted mainly to the so-called double standard of sex morality, and to the future form of the family. Are men to continue their enjoyment of freedom while chastity is strictly demanded by women, and is our present monogamic family destined to be permanent? These are the questions most anxiously asked.

Concerning the double standard, we must admit right at the outset that it was not the product of an impartial recogni-

tion of natural sex distinctions, but arose and continued to exist as one of the many concomitants of man's original physical supremacy over woman. Its present advocates have no difficulty in advancing spurious reasons for its continuation, reasons which were threshed out and found wanting innumerable times. To tell the simple truth, these advocates have their emotions and feelings enlisted in behalf of the double standard thru heredity and up-bringing, and seek to support it by grasping at any accessible argument.

The history of morals shows repeatedly, how people have never been at a loss to find apparently plausible reasons for the most iniquitous customs and institutions. The wholesale burning alive of heretics was eloquently defended several centuries ago, when pious Christian ladies witnessed auto-da-fés, and looked on complacently at the roasting unbelievers. The early Christian ancestors of these ladies, a

thousand years or more further back, were customarily tied to the branches of trees and set on fire, in order to entertain Roman ladies with nocturnal illuminations—a spectacle immortalized in Semiradski's famous painting. The fanatic religious and political zeal of those times stifled the sympathetic emotions and found vent in torture and martyrdom, while defenders of faith were ready with a storehouse of argumentative ammunition to justify inhuman cruelties *ad majorem Dei gloriam.*

Nor was it otherwise with the unjust treatment of women in past ages. It had to be justified *post factum,* and a most original defence was accordingly unearthed. "In ancient Greece," relates Lecky, "the inferiority of women to men was strongly asserted, and it was illustrated and defended by a very curious physiological notion, that the generative power belonged exclusively to men,

women having only a very subordinate part in the production of their children. Aeschylus has put this notion into the mouth of Apollo in a speech in the Eumenides. It has, however, been very widely diffused, and may be found in Indian, Greek, Roman and even Christian writers. St. Thomas Aquinas accepted it and argued from it that a father should be more loved than a mother."

This monstrous invention has been paralleled in modern times by some of the arguments advanced in opposition to woman's emancipation. The reluctance, conscious or subconscious, to admit the rôle played by brute force in the subjection of women is the true source of these interesting inspirations. Fortunately the truth cannot be suppressed forever, and impartial scientists have shown conclusively that the dual standard did not emanate from the head, but originated in the fist. So cautious a moralist as Lecky ex-

presses himself as follows: "The contrast between the levity with which the frailty of men has in most ages been regarded, and the extreme severity with which women who have been guilty of the same offense have been treated, forms one of the most singular anomalies in moral history, and appears the more remarkable when we remember that the temptation usually springs from the sex which is so readily pardoned. . . . *Much of our feeling on these subjects is due to laws and moral systems which were formed by men, and were in the first instance intended for their own protection.*" In his recent work on "Divorce," Prof. Lichtenberger writes in a similar vein: "The social inferiority of women in all ages is largely responsible for the rise and persistence of the dual standard." These words may be said to represent correctly the consensus of scientific opinion on the subject.

Among writers of fiction we find so

deep a thinker as George Meredith taking the same view. He considers the discrimination against women in matters of sex by men who claim for themselves unrestricted liberties, as part of the Grand Turk ideal of woman. In "Diana of the Crossways," he puts these words in the mouth of the heroine: "Men may have rounded Seraglio Point. They have not yet doubled Cape Turk."

Indeed, were the denial of equitable treatment to women not rooted deeply in primitive emotions, it could scarcely have withstood the repeated assaults made upon it during the past two thousand years or more. Even at a time when the most flagrant corruption reigned in Rome, the moralists emphatically asserted that fidelity in wedlock should be exacted from husband as well as wife. Such was not the case in earlier Roman days, when only the wife was legally punished for infractions of the nuptial tie. In fact, it ap-

pears to have been the rule in all early societies to saddle the penalty for adultery upon the woman, leaving the man unmolested. Occasionally, we do meet with a reversal of this standard, as among certain Hill-tribes of India, which condone infidelity on the part of the wife, while it is held to be highly dishonorable on the part of the husband. However, such anomalies are extremely rare, the female transgressor being quite uniformly singled out for obloquy and punishment. The faithless wife may be given a sound beating, or her body may be mutilated, or she may even be put to death in various prescribed ways.

This crying injustice of making the woman a scapegoat survived the united attacks of Greek and Roman writers. Aristotle, Plutarch, Seneca, and Plautus vainly exhorted the husbands to observe in marriage the loyalty they demanded from their wives. In subsequent ages,

the Christian Fathers continued to harangue the cruel laws which penalized disloyal wives but not truant husbands. The total failure of this prolonged moral crusade might well astonish those who put their faith in preaching. "At the present day," complains Lecky, "tho the standard of morals is far higher than in Pagan Rome, it may be questioned whether the inequality of the censure which is bestowed upon the two sexes is not as great as in the days of Paganism, and that inequality is continually the cause of the most shameful and the most pitiable injustice. The fundamental truth, that the same act can never be at once venial for a man to demand, and infamous for a woman to accord, tho nobly enforced by the early Christians, has not passed into the popular sentiment of Christendom."

After centuries of moralizing, we have failed to improve much upon the semi-civilized past, and if our only hope of

amelioration depended on preaching and exhortation, progress might be delayed for centuries longer. Fortunately, the outlook is not so gloomy, as we shall presently see.

The passages quoted deal mainly with the unfair treatment of the married woman. So little having been achieved in dislodging the evil from the marriage bond, where its iniquity is so potent that the laws and moral injunctions of civilized peoples condemn it almost unanimously, how much can a campaign of arguments and precepts avail against the same injustice in the sexual life of the unmarried? Need we feel surprise at the current rigid and ruthless discrimination visited upon the unmarried woman? This attitude has become so habitual that it is frequently declared to be innate, or due to a natural instinctive feeling which carries its own justification.

Nothing could be more fallacious.

Even a cursory glance at the customs of various nations and races ought to expose the untenability of this bold assertion. To pick out only a few salient examples from an overwhelming mass of material, we may cite peoples among whom chastity is required of the single man, while the girls are completely unrestrained in their sexual life. Some tribes do not exact fidelity even from the married woman. So little value is placed on chastity by many tribes, that to offer a wife or daughter to a visitor for the night is a sacred duty of hospitality, and to decline the favor is to give mortal offense. Thus we are told of the Asiatic Chukchis: "They offer to travelers who chance to visit them, their wives, and also what we should call their daughters' honor, and resent as a deadly affront any refusal of such offers" (Erman). The Indian Chinooks lend their wives and daughters for a fish-hook or a strand of beads, and to decline the offer

SEX MORALITY — JACOBI

is to offend the lady and insult the whole tribe. The Bushman husband often accords his wife permission to cohabit with a stranger, and the Greenland Esquimaux call a man noble and good tempered if he lends his wife to his friends. They also consider it a mark of great friendship for two men to exchange wives temporarily; and the Chippewayans, who have the same custom, esteem such an exchange as one of the strongest ties of affection between two families.

While these savages attach so little importance to the purity of their women, others go a step further and consider chastity in the bride a downright disgrace, being evidence of her unpopularity with men. The Chibchas "think their virgin brides unfortunate and without luck, as they had not inspired affection in men: accordingly, they dislike them as miserable women."

Frequently, absolute freedom before

marriage is found co-existent with great strictness afterward. The same Chibcha husband who is grieved because his bride is a virgin, becomes very sensitive to infidelity in his married life. Among the Koniagas, a single woman is unrestricted in her sexual relations with men, but once married, she must be faithful to her husband; and the same is reported about many other tribes.

An interesting compromise between complete liberty and rigid fidelity has been struck by certain Arabs, among whom marriage is for a part of the week, usually four days (if the bride's mother is an able bargainer, she may succeed in making this interval only two days); the remaining time belongs to the wife, who is free to indulge in amorous adventures, and it is even said that her husband feels flattered if she has many intrigues on her off days. The same significance as a transitional stage may be attached to a

rather common custom in various countries of permitting complete sexual liberty to men and women on certain yearly festivals, tho strict chastity is enforced at all other times.

Lest it be retorted that such standards are inconceivable in a civilized nation, we may here refer to the Japanese. So free are they from our squeamishness, that obedience and self-abnegation are rated above chastity in their hierarchy of virtues. In one of their most popular historic dramas, the heroine voluntarily sells herself to the proprietor of a brothel in order to retrieve her family's fortunes. Such episodes used to be quite commonplace, and the custom of selling daughters for a specified period is alleged to be far from extinct even to-day. No disgrace attaches to the girl, who returns to her family afterwards; on the contrary, she is honored for her filial sacrifice. Equally familiar is the Japanese institution of

temporary marriages. It is quite customary for Europeans who visit Japan to marry native girls for a short period, and dissolve the union on leaving the country. A Russian writer tells the true story of an army officer who contracted such a marriage with a young and beautiful girl of good family. He was so enchanted with his fair consort that he resolved to make the union permanent. Urgent duties called him away for a few months, and he spent the interval in dreaming of their future bliss. On his return, a most affectionate meeting takes place. In the midst of tender caresses the delighted husband notices a young man packing his effects and preparing to leave. "Who is that?" he inquires. "Oh, don't mind him," replies the smiling wife. "He has to go now. I admitted him only on condition that he depart at once when you come back." This ingenuous confession breaks the officer's heart, and he deserts

the dearly-loved woman. She, too, is grief-stricken, yet totally incapable of understanding his indignation. "Had you only told me it would hurt your feelings," she exclaims sorrowfully before the final parting.

Strongly contrasting with these people are others, equally numerous, among whom chastity is valued very highly. Many primitive tribes cherish jealously the virtue of their women. The Mandan maidens are described as beautiful and unapproachable; the wayward Chippewa lass can never hope to marry a warrior; the Kaffir girl is chaste and modest; the Sumatran single woman guards her honor like a Vestal. These are statements of travelers and explorers, but even making due allowance for exaggeration, the truth stands out clearly, that among existing peoples, primitive and cultured, all degrees of sentiment in regard to female purity may be found manifested, from the

one extreme of declaring it a disgrace, to the opposite extreme of giving it precedence over all other virtues, and making it an indispensable condition of moral excellence.

Neither does the evidence warrant the contention sometimes heard that regard for chastity rises *pari passu* with civilization. "Some peoples who are in other respects among the lowest, are in this respect among the highest," says Spencer in his analysis of the subject, and this may also be gathered from the examples just cited.

Our main purpose in giving these illustrations has been to dispose effectually of the stubborn fallacy which declares our modern conventional conceptions of sex morality to be *innate.* Sentiments showing such a bewildering lack of uniformity in the different varieties of the human species, cannot be called innate without doing violence to the term.

Leaving aside these and similar attempts to bolster up our unfair system with false assertions, let us now submit the system itself to a critical examination. Our so-called double standard ordains that woman should abstain from all sexual intercourse outside of wedlock, and practice intercourse exclusively with one man in wedlock. Now, if all women should actually conform to this demand, realizing it absolutely, it follows that no man would be able to indulge in sexual connections outside of wedlock, for sheer lack of a female partner. This conclusion is no mere sophism. It cannot possibly be evaded. To say that single men are free to indulge in sexual intercourse, while women, both single and married, must guard their purity, is to commit one's self to a *reductio ad absurdum!* Given a community of unapproachably chaste women, according to the ideal set up by our "moral law," and where is the

single man to find a companion for his extra-marital intrigues? Manifestly, universal female chastity would entail universal male chastity.

Thus our double standard, which has resulted in such contradictory and mutually destructive demands upon the female sex, turns out on closer scrutiny to be a miserable paradox.

There is only one way leading out of this logical labyrinth—namely, to set aside a class of women and exempt them from the requirement of purity. They will supply a channel for drawing off the uncontrollable excess of sexual passion in men, and thus allow the balance of womankind to preserve their "honor." Such a compromise does exist in reality, and our prostitute is the representative of this scapegoat-class. "Herself the supreme type of vice," says Lecky in a familiar eloquent passage, "she is ultimately the efficient guardian of virtue. But for her

the unchallenged purity of countless happy homes would be polluted. On that one ignoble and degraded form are concentrated the passions that might have filled the world with shame."

Only at such an expense, with the aid of such an expedient, can the monstrous, self-contradictory double standard be maintained at all. Without this subterfuge it must inevitably collapse. All women cannot remain chaste unless all men remain chaste. This proposition is an unassailable logical stronghold. A lapse from purity on the part of any man implies a like lapse on the part of some woman. The sexes are thus seen to stand and fall together. Prostitution is the ransom we are paying for our iniquitous sex morality. It is the modern Minotaur, grown to gigantic dimensions like all things modern, devouring his annual tribute of thousands of our maidens.

III

Turn we now from the barbarian Past and the semi-civilized Present to contemplate the promise of the Future. Is the current moral system destined to endure forever? Are we doomed to live perpetually in the shadow of the dual standard, with the canker of prostitution as its safety valve, or may we take heart in looking forward to an approaching order that will no longer do violence to our sense of equity, our sympathies and our reason? Is Theseus coming to deliver us from the Minotaur? Are new social forms to arise and supplant the decaying ones, as Evolution carries the race onward along its predetermined course?

Before these anxious queries could be answered in detail, an inventory would have to be taken of the multitudinous causes now in action thruout society, and their distant effects precisely calculated. The knowledge thus obtained would lift

the veil concealing the future, and allow our mind's eye to dwell on a vision of things lying unborn in the womb of Time. To cope with such an undertaking, our limited faculty is utterly inadequate. Nowhere else is causation so complex and so elusive as in the phenomena constituting social science. Even the immediate effects of present causes can be outlined dimly and with great difficulty; the remote effects are beyond computation. This obstacle, however, does not deter our self-styled prophets. Seizing some factor now prominent in its influence, they proceed to construct a definite future upon the basis of its present action, as if any cause will go on producing its effects for all time, without being crossed and recrossed by thousands of other causes working out their thousands of effects. It is assumed that one thing will change while others will remain unchanged.

Detailed prophecy is not attainable in

social phenomena. All we can attempt is to point out the more conspicuous forces and their probable immediate results, since ultimate results are beyond the scope of human vision. In this cautious spirit of qualified prediction, we may venture to indicate a few potent agencies at present active in working serious changes in our social order, and incidentally playing havoc with our conventional sex morality.

Foremost among these agencies stands the emancipation of women. Two generations have witnessed the elevation of woman from a subordinate position to a station of approximate equality with man. In our day, when all occupations and professions have been thrown open to women, and their complete conquest of suffrage rights is only a question of years, it is difficult to realize that a few decades ago it was considered highly improper for a woman to engage in any activity which took her outside of the narrow confines of

the home. The fetich of "womanliness" banished the entire sex from the broad field of business, from the calling of law and of medicine, from the stage, and even from art and literature. All these, together with war and politics, belonged to man's exclusive domain, while woman's time and interests were to be partitioned mainly between the kitchen and the nursery. The bearing and rearing of children was her duty to the race, and ample compensation for sacrificing her own individuality. She was considered a mere childbearing apparatus, as Bebel says.

And now, the daughters and granddaughters of those household drudges have broken the spell of centuries, and are invading the trades, professions, arts and sciences, and forcing man, their late master, into an attitude of self-defence. Like a deposed sovereign, he is slowly awakening to the bleak realization of forfeited power. His vassals, so meekly submis-

sive but yesterday, laugh at his commands in open defiance. But the habits of centuries are not easily outgrown, and he will need much time to adjust himself to the new conditions. Human ideas and sentiments do not change as rapidly as circumstances, and hence woman, no less than man, is but slowly adapting her conduct to the novel acquisition of freedom. Hence, too, occasional inevitable excrescences in her behavior.

Eventually, this process of readjustment, habitually repressing man's old pretensions, and simultaneously encouraging woman's new aspirations, must bring about an approximate equalization of rights and privileges, including those concerned with sex relations. Meanwhile, we shall continue to witness the numerous compromises between old and new ethical forms so characteristic of all transitional stages.

Another important modern factor,

which must prove instrumental in modifying our sex morality, is the practice of artificially regulating conception. Whatever ideas one may entertain upon the ethical aspects of this question, no one can deny the increasingly frequent resort to prophylaxis of conception (as it may fitly be designated, the Greek term meaning "guarding against" or "warding off"). We are here concerned solely with the indirect bearing of this custom (for such it is rapidly becoming) upon the general status of sex relations. By conferring upon woman immunity from the most dreaded sequel of illicit indulgence, prophylaxis of conception undoubtedly tends to equalize the conduct of both sexes when confronted by temptation. It also deals a weighty blow to a time-worn defence of the double standard, namely, that argument that while a mother naturally knows the child to be her own, a husband can never be sure of his paternity, unless he

has implicit faith in his wife. This contention has very recently been touched upon in a successful play ("As a Man Thinks").[1] It is seriously to be feared, however, that further improvement and extension of prophylactic measures directed against unwelcome conception, will consign this favorite argument of reactionaries to the museum of ancient armor. And conception is being more and more frequently regulated in all civilized countries. Even the triple alliance of clergy, emperor and ex-president will not intimidate women into child-bearing under unfavorable economic and other conditions. But, of course, those who believe in governing conduct by preaching, will continue to preach.

The third great factor promising to play a star rôle in revolutionizing our notions of sex morality, is the modern

[1] And is the subject of Strindberg's powerful and grewsome tragedy, "Father."—W. J. R.

movement of industrial reform. The coming abolition of present glaring economic inequalities will be accompanied by a decay of our system of prostitution. All are agreed that the driving power behind women who join the ranks of prostitutes is "the most extreme poverty" (Lecky). With the extinction of wage-slavery, the supply of recruits to the army of white slaves must largely cease, and in the absence of prostitution, as we have seen, our double standard loses its main support. Simultaneously, the removal of economic stress, while facilitating marriage in general, will in particular encourage early marriages, and thus greatly shorten the stormy period lying between puberty and wedlock, which is prolonged beyond all wholesome limits at present, and in which so much sexual aberration falls.

Such are the three principal agencies to be reckoned with in forecasting the fu-

ture status of sex morality. Slowly working out their effects, they promise to achieve what the repeated onslaughts of past centuries have been powerless to accomplish. The impregnable fortress, having weathered the hurricanes and battering rams of ages, is nearing the day of its downfall. Where the crude and spectacular assaults failed, the invisible disintegrating forces of the soil succeeded. They have undermined and honeycombed the foundation rock, and at last the unyielding superstructure is doomed.

The fall of the current incongruous system of sex morality is assured. Equalization of privileges accorded to the sexes has already set in and must continue, but *whether it will work upward by expanding woman's sphere of liberty, or downward by limiting man's freedom,* is by no means plainly apparent. That the coming order will not be founded on gross injustice and sex-favoritism, may be safely predicted,

but greater detail of prophecy is hazardous, causation being here too complex for computation. From the general laws of evolution it may be inferred that the ultimate form of sex relations will not be reached by a sudden metamorphosis, but by gradual approximations and compromises and occasional backslidings, in obedience to the law of rhythm manifest thruout all phenomena. Action is ever followed by reaction. After centuries of extreme discrimination against women in matters of individual liberty, we are now witnessing the return swing of the pendulum, which threatens to carry us to the opposite extreme of unlimited license.

From this point of view we can understand the large quantity of radical sentiment on sexual matters displayed in the life and literature of our time. The revolt against the relentless sentence passed upon the woman who violated the "moral law," has carried away the headlong pro-

gressives to the opposite side. Give the girl full liberty to love, they say. Motherhood is the highest function of woman and should not be made dependent on accidental circumstances favoring or impeding marriage. Single or wedded, the young human female must fulfil her loftiest duty to the race by bearing children. In England, George Bernard Shaw is the brilliant exponent of this idea. In his "pleasant play" called "Getting Married," he pleads for the right of free motherhood. Many old maids would make excellent mothers, he says, and it is a pity to let them waste fine opportunities. Husband or no husband, they should not be restrained from realizing nature's purpose. "What we must fight for," he exclaims, "is freedom to breed the race without being hampered by the mass of irrelevant conditions implied in the institution of marriage. What we need is freedom for people who have never seen

each other and never intend to see each other again, to produce children under certain definite public conditions without loss of honor." Lyman Abbott comments upon this outburst as follows: "The fact that Shaw gives this message to the twentieth century and the twentieth century listens to it, is not without significance."

In France, Maxime Formant, in a novel called "The Sower," capitalizes this "right to free motherhood" for the purpose of fiction. In his preface he remarks that modern philosophers have recognized the right to every normal instinct to be satisfied and goes on to say: "But so far we do not find any question as to the rights of motherhood regarded as a thing which is desirable in itself. It seems to be considered lawful for a woman to love apart from marriage, but no one has yet given a thought to the woman who, aspiring only to motherhood, is compelled by cir-

cumstances to seek it apart from wedlock. Without wishing to set up the hierarchy of our instincts, may we not say that the particular one which provides for the continuation of the species is quite as lawful and primordial as that which ministers to the satisfaction of the individual?" The story itself deals with a girl who has been brought up to recognize that maternity is the highest aim of woman, no matter how she comes by the child. Accordingly, having failed to get a husband in the conventional way, she sets out from home in search of a father for her future child, and, needless to say, has no difficulty in soon finding him.

Other writers, while stopping short of advocating free motherhood, make a strong appeal for greater leniency towards the girl who has "sinned" or has become a mother.

Thomas Hardy, especially, is fond of delving deeply into the psychology of

man's retrospective jealousy, and in "A Pair of Blue Eyes" he graphically depicts the pathetic tragedy precipitated by the protagonist's irrational attitude towards a girl's previous escapade. Misunderstanding her stammering confession, he leaps at the wildest conclusions and spurns the girl he loves. Her affection and his own cannot stem the flood of his righteous indignation. He will not bestow his heart upon a woman who has committed a *faux pas,* and turns a stony ear to all her entreaties. The truth is revealed when it is too late for reparation. In his other novels, Hardy returns to this *motif,* and again shows the sad consequence of man's implacably unforgiving behavior on learning a woman's past.

More directly than Hardy, George Meredith pleads in nearly all his novels for more toleration and equity on the part of the male sex. His treatment of this theme is characterized as follows by W.

C. Brownell ("Victorian Prose Masters"): "With Meredith all this is changed by endowing women with an organization morally equivalent—and perhaps one may even say ethically identical—with that of men. He considers their responsibility the same, and as a consequence, neither enjoys, in virtue of any singularity of native constitution, an immunity denied to the other. They are played upon by an equally wide range of conflicting emotions, desires, temptations. When they succumb, they fall no lower, having suffered no perversion of their higher nature. 'Diana' is the book in which his ideal of the equivalence—as distinguished from the mere interdependence—of the sexes is most explicitly exposed, tho everywhere in his novels one finds evidence of it, and, as an important deduction in detail from this general proposition, the according to women of a sentimental freedom corresponding to the

grosser liberty condoned in men. Meredith seems to say: What is this bloom of innocence you prize so highly and possess so little of? Merely the desideratum of a crude, not to say savage instinct of the masterful male. Evolution will inevitably dispose of it in due season, and meantime it would be the part of wisdom in you to wince less and be worthier." In "Rhoda Fleming" Meredith arraigns our double standard as follows: "All these false sensations, peculiar to men, concerning the soiled purity of woman, the lost innocence, the brand of shame upon her, are commonly the foul sentimentalism of such as can be too eager in the chase of corruption when occasion suits, and are another side of pruriency, not absolutely foreign to the best of us."

In Russia, some three years ago, a prominent writer, Artsibasheff, entered the lists in the struggle against conventional morality with a highly sensational

novel called "Sanin," which gave rise to endless discussions and precipitated a veritable deluge of polemical literature. Tho strongly condemned in some quarters, and received with puzzled head-shakings in others, the book made a profound and lasting impression, and has been translated into several European languages. It is a powerfully written story, interspersed with many and well-aimed thrusts at our vicious sex-conventions.[2] Retrospective jealousy toward a woman's previous experience in love comes in for an especially merciless excoriation, seldom paralleled in its brutally cynical frankness, which furnishes an interesting foil to Hardy's dispassionate treatment of the same theme. In this altogether remarkable novel, the author, using his hero as a mouth-piece, advocates a substitute for the free motherhood of Shaw—namely the expedient of

[2] A review of Sanin by the Editor appeared in THE CRITIC AND GUIDE for October 1909.—W. J. R.

abortion. This act he does not consider criminal and equivalent to murder, but calls it simply an interruption of a "chemical reaction," provided it is resorted to promptly enough. The general view he takes of female chastity must be characterized as cynical, tho purporting to be merely rational. Unrestrained sexual gratification is painted in such glowing colors that hundreds of young readers had their heads turned, and throwing all conventions aside, gave themselves up to veritable orgies. Young people of both sexes indulged in unrestrained promiscuity, until brought back to their senses by the ravages of venereal diseases—and pregnancy.

In Scandinavia, the problem of chastity in its relation to the unmarried man forms the subject matter of Björnson's masterly story called "The Glove," while Ellen Key, the well-known Swedish radical and reformer, discusses sex matters in her

book on "Love and Marriage." She preaches freedom of love and freedom of divorce. She warns, however, against confounding her freedom of love with so called free love, which is often understood to mean complete license.

These few examples, culled from representative writers, will suffice to indicate the drift of liberal modern opinion on the subject of our dual standard. Bitterly opposed to these progressive ideas are the conservative writers and speakers, who cling tenaciously to the current code of ethics. Both parties lay claim to the truth, each freely denouncing the other as an enemy of society. This alignment of forces on opposite sides appears to be an essential condition of progress. The sharp division into rival camps meets us everywhere—in politics, in science, in art, even in daily comment upon trivial topics. The party of reform and the party of resistance are both necessary for moderate

advancement. To adapt a metaphor from Meredith, one is the stream, the other the dam. Without the one, complete stagnation would supervene; without the other, headlong changes might disrupt society. The combined effect of both, exerting themselves in contrary directions, is a normal rate of rhythmic forward movement.

Such being the mechanism of social evolution, the contending factions mentioned above may be trusted to work out gradually the coming sex morality. In the meantime, it is the course of wisdom not to interfere with progress by limiting freedom of speech. In the words of Herbert Spencer, "there may be danger in assuming too confidently that our opinions concerning the relations of the sexes are just what they should be. In all times and places, people have been positive that their ideas and feelings on these matters have been right; and yet, assuming that

we are right, they must have been wrong. Restraints on free speech concerning the relations of the sexes may possibly be hindrances to something better or higher."

It remains for us to consider the future form of the family, and this will be done in the following section.

IV

When studying the rhythmic course of ethical development, we are frequently in danger of misinterpreting a temporary phase of retrogression for a permanent change. To this error must be ascribed the position taken by many modern writers in regard to the monogamic form of marriage. Observing its present shortcomings and the real increase in the divorce rate, they become needlessly alarmed, and rush to the conclusion that monogamy is a failure and must be superseded by a different arrangement. Their inference is not upheld by those who have

devoted themselves to a deeper study of the subject. Let us hear a few representative voices.

In his recent book on "Divorce," Prof. Lichtenberger says: "Present tendencies do not mean the disruption of the family. They reveal the struggles of adjustment antecedent to more wholesome conditions. With the increasing recognition of the civil-contract theory of marriage and the growing appreciation of individual rights, there is destined to come greater freedom of divorce. The probable immediate result will be a further rise in the divorce rate. The net result of the modern movement will be to place marriage upon a better basis with larger guarantees of its permanency. An appropriate equality of economic opportunity will overcome sex dependence, and an equal standard of morals will minimize sexual immorality. Theoretical monogamy will tend to become actual monogamy."

We are as yet remote from such an ideal. We are passing thru a transitional stage, and our marriage relation shares the imperfections of all our institutions. But the outlook upon the future is calculated to inspire courage and hopefulness. "There is abundant evidence," assures us Westermark (History of Human Marriage), "that marriage has, upon the whole, become more durable in proportion as the human race has risen to higher degrees of cultivation, and that a certain amount of civilization is an essential condition of the formation of life-long unions."

Speaking of ancient forms, Prof. Howard (History of Matrimonial Institutions) says: "The complex phenomena of human sexual relations have been examined in the light of scientific criticism. The result seems unmistakably to show that pairing has always been the typical form of human marriage. Early monog-

amy takes its rise beyond the borderland separating men from lower animals. At the dawn of human history, individual marriage prevails, tho the union is not always lasting. In the later stages, various forms of polygamy make their appearance, tho monogamy as the type is never superseded."

Modern monogamy, according to Lichtenberger, is the only form which meets universal ethical sanction among the civilized nations of the earth. The utilitarian arguments in its favor are summed up by Lecky in three sentences: Nature, by making the number of males and females nearly equal, indicates it as natural. In no other form of marriage can the government of the family be so happily sustained. In no other does woman assume the position of the equal of man.

These views are concurred in by numerous authoritative writers. Smyth calls life-long monogamy "the only relation

that can be thought of as meeting the full claims and obligations of personality." Spencer's resumé deserves to be quoted at greater length: "The monogamic form of the sexual relation is manifestly the ultimate form; and any change to be anticipated must be in the direction of completion and extension of it. Future evolution may be expected to extend the monogamic relation by extinguishing promiscuity, and by suppressing such crimes as bigamy and adultery. . . . With an increase of altruism must go a decrease of domestic dissension. Whence, simultaneously a strengthening of the moral bond and a weakening of the forces tending to destroy it."

In several ways future development may be expected to contribute to the solution of our present perplexity concerning sexual conditions, and to the growing stability of the monogamic union. With advancing civilization there seems to go

pari passu a diminishing intensity of the sexual passion. A comparison of its uncontrollable power in the lower races with its partial amenability to reason characterizing the higher, justifies this statement and the hope that with further progress will come a still greater weakening of this instinct, possibly down to the limit necessary for race preservation, which ought to be compatible with very low grades of sexuality. Another important concomitant of civilization is the steadily growing power of self-control, which also becomes apparent on contrasting the impulsive nature of the savage with the comparatively self-contained nature of the modern cultured man. Continued evolution may be trusted to produce a type of humanity exhibiting far greater subordination of the lower instincts to the higher faculties than is vouchsafed to us at present.

The coöperation of these two factors, diminishing sexual passion and increasing

inhibition of the lower centers by the higher, must play a strong part in determining conduct in the future. The Song of the Sirens will lose much of its fascination, and bands of steel will hold Ulysses secured to the mast. The outcome of the conflict between duty and desire will be decided without long and anxious vacillations.

Here, too, we may fitly mention and condemn the artificial excitation of sexual activity so noticeable everywhere, and so often resorted to from motives of commercial greed. The immodest fashions in the dress of women, the lascivious exhibitions on the stage, the obscene art, the pornographic literature, the indulgence in alcohol and in narcotics—all are calculated to arouse prematurely and stimulate continually an instinct sufficiently assertive by nature, and in need of restraint rather than encouragement. It may not be leaning too far on the side of optimism to

predict that in the future a more rational mode of living will allow the procreative function to assume a lower habitual level of activity, and will eliminate many of its undesirable manifestations.

In conclusion, the reader's attention is invited to dwell upon the moulding of sentiments in conformity with institutions exhibited by societies in all stages of development. Any particular social arrangement invariably generates in the course of time a body of harmonious feelings, which make it seem appropriate and rational. Nations practising a form of marriage widely different from our own, show the same fervor in its defence, and the same intolerance towards other forms. The polygamous peoples of the East express amazement and loathing at the one-wife system, and sometimes indignantly refuse to believe in its existence. It is simply impossible, said an Arab sheik to a traveler, that in England a man can be

contented with one wife. In Africa, we are told by Reade, a wife insists that her husband marry again, and calls him a stingy fellow if he refuses. Livingstone relates that negro women were shocked on hearing that in Europe a man has only one wife, and said it was not respectable. It is even hardly necessary to go so far for examples, when in our own midst there exists a polygamous community, whose women do not feel any repugnance towards the system of plural wives, "On the contrary," says a recent writer, "I failed to find a single Mormon woman who did not strongly uphold polygamy and proclaim her regret at its discontinuance. One instance of this may serve as an example: two young girls who had been bosom friends from infancy, had planned as their life ideal that they should marry the same man."

All these illustrations of sentiments adapted to circumstances justify the in-

ference, that among ourselves the continuance of monogamic marriage will go on strengthening the sentiments appropriate to it, and will in time create a feeling of extreme repugnance towards any violation of the nuptial tie.

In the interim, we must be satisfied with crude approximations to this remote ideal. Compromise is the term which best characterizes our current morality. Compromises are unavoidable in our transitional stage of civilization, and especially within the sphere of sex relations.

That even in the far more stable monogamic relation of the distant future compromises will obtain, may be gathered from the following passage: "It by no means follows," says Lecky, "that because the life-long union of one man and one woman should be the dominant type it should be the only one, or that the interests of society demand that all connections should be forced into the same die. Connections

which were confessedly only for a few years have always subsisted side by side with permanent marriages. In the immense variety of circumstances and characters, cases will always appear in which, on utilitarian grounds, extra-matrimonial connections might seem advisable."

Such alliances are at present clandestine and therefore demoralizing. The urgent need of secrecy leads to deceit and crime and other reprehensible forms of conduct. Hence, sporadic attempts have been made to obtain public recognition for free unions under certain oppressive economic conditions which preclude wedlock.

Possibly, future evolution will discover a means of reconciling permanent marriage with alliances of a less stable character, by removing the stigma now attaching to them, and declaring them legitimate, tho reserving the highest ethical sanction for life-long monogamy.

To sum up our ratiocinations before

leaving the subject, we may say that mankind will in time relegate prostitution and adultery to the past, and marital relations will be entered upon without undue delay after puberty. Possibly we are not trespassing far on forbidden ground by taking one more step, and saying that the general advent of clean and early marriages will foreshadow an ultimate single standard of pre-matrimonial continence, equally binding for both sexes.

SEX MORALITY,
PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE:

OR

MONOGAMY VS. VARIETY

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

SEX MORALITY, PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

DR. JACOBI'S article, in the main excellent and convincing, probably contains as strong meat as the average reader will be able to digest. Those of us who have come to somewhat more positive conclusions of a radical nature, cannot complain of being too harshly treated. Like Dr. Jacobi, tho without his lurking bias in favor of institutional monogamy, which, in spite of his efforts at strict neutrality, persists in peeping out here and there in his discussion, we abjure the rôle of the prophet. The possibilities of unforeseen adjustments in future standards governing sex relations are innumerable; and an increasing modesty is sequent upon continued study of the subject. The concluding volume of Havelock Ellis's splendid series on "The Psychology of

Sex" includes perhaps as satisfactory a summary of the views best warranted in the present state of research and thought on the subject, as is now extant; altho the existing tendency toward the acquisition of knowledge on the subject of sex, and the recasting of old theories and dogmas in the light of added discoveries, will doubtless throw much light on the yet obscure phases of the problem.

Even in the present state of knowledge, it is possible to assert authoritatively that the axe has been laid to the root of the prevalent superstitions concerning sex. We are at last learning that this last stronghold of the exploded absolutist philosophy must give way to the universal principle of relativity of standards. In practically every other department of ethical and social conduct, the lesson was learned long ago; but Spencer himself, the great exponent of relativity, lost sight completely of his own principle when

treating of matrimonial institutionalism. Clear thinker tho he was, the obsession of his age was upon him; and it is the British *bon bourgeois* and not the scientific reasoner who pronounces dogmatically in favor of the future dominance of an increasingly rigorous monogamy.

Herein may be seen the fallacy of the attempt to crush the iconoclastic assailant of the monogamic ideal, by pointing out the fact that the majority of the leaders in scientific thought hold firmly to the conventional principle. It is on a par with the unfortunate citation of Gladstone as a profound thinker loyal to the orthodox religious creed. When Blackstone, great jurist as he was, rehearsed in abundant detail the amazing list of disabilities imposed on married women by the common law of England, and in all seriousness and good faith affirmed that the shackles of woman's enslavement were so many proofs of the good will of the common law

toward her and of its zeal for her protection, he presented himself as a permanent type of the masterly mind, which is yet incapable of escaping from a fixed rut of thought on certain issues assumed to have been once for all settled by a preceding age. Unfortunately, however, such issues have a way of becoming again unsettled; and not Blackstone, Gladstone nor Spencer can stay the tide of investigation.

Without doubt, the double standard of sex ethics is hopelessly doomed. It was from the beginning rooted in injustice, and founded on male domination. It is the asserted will of the slave owner, and cannot stand in an age of growing recognition of equal rights. The only dispute is with reference to the nature of the readjustment which must follow the disappearance of this monstrosity of custom. Perpetual monogamy for both sexes, monogamy for most women coupled with

the special ministration to men's sexual demands by a small percentage of women corresponding to the prostitute class of to-day, and free love under some aspect or under several aspects, probably sum up the entire range of choice for a society which is to be conceived as progressing, rather than retrograding; since institutional polygamy and polyandry, complex marriage and disorderly promiscuity may be dismissed as incapable of finding serious advocates.

The first proposition is of course the popular one. All who seek the applause of the conventional world vie with one another in the loudness of their declarations of adhesion to it. The pulpits are *ex officio* committed to it, regardless of any possible considerations to the contrary. In most selfstyled "respectable" circles, no other view can even obtain a hearing; and the mere suggestion that any different proposition deserves even a

decent investigation is met with hysterical shrieks of vituperation. The frantic howls and violent appeals to emotional prejudice, which assailed George Meredith and later Mrs. Elsie Parsons, for the mere hint that some form of trial marriage might prove worth considering under conceivable conditions, may be expected by any person who ventures to ask in all good faith for permission to test the innate sacredness of the commonly worshipped taboo.

While it is, of course, possible that a perfect monogamy may become the dominant form of sexual life, it rests under suspicion, in view of the manner in which its champions proceed. An unquestionably good cause need not resort to hysterics, to persecution, to suppression of free speech, in order to maintain itself. It will rather demonstrate its superiority by clearcut reasoning, and welcome the freest experiments with rival plans, in order that

its greater value may be made evident to all. If monogamy is to emerge the winner, it is certain that its victory must be preceded by a long period of infinitely greater tolerance than at present. As to the certainty of such triumph, however, no sufficient data have yet been presented.

The three great changes dwelt on by Dr. Jacobi are assuredly not conclusive. The recognition of equality between the sexes is no guarantee that new fetters are to be put on the male, when the more natural sequence would seem to be the removal of the shackles with which the female has so long been bound. The intelligent control of conception certainly does not inevitably make for a more rigid monogamy. The industrial emancipation of woman, while sounding the death-note of commercialized prostitution, merely removes a spur to the acceptance of otherwise undesired relations. To support his personal inclination to the monogamic

position, Dr. Jacobi rests mainly on the somewhat dubious supposition that sex passion tends to decrease *pari passu* with the advance of civilization, and on the assurance that the race is developing self-control. Neither of these facts, if facts they may be held to be, has of itself a necessary bearing on the question of monogamy. Restraint from excess does not necessarily involve exclusive devotion to one object. The refined epicure eats delicately, but enjoys a greater variety of viands than the undiscriminating glutton, to whom quantity is the prime consideration. There are men and women of varied loves, whose total of sexual indulgence is immeasurably less than that of many insatiable married persons, whose extravagant excesses, tho confined to the "virtuous" marriage couch, would be tolerated in few brothels.

As to the permanent existence of a prostitute class, the thing is scarcely conceiv-

able. The offensive vulgarity of a purely mercenary relation, while tolerated under existing circumstances as a miserable makeshift, must ultimately become incompatible with a finer type of humanity. If it be true (which is subject to the gravest doubts) that man is instinctively polygamous, and that the vast majority of women are monogamous, the result may be the establishment of monogamy as the rule, tempered by the existence of a less specialized class of women than the prostitutes of to-day, who will become willing partners of such men as attract them, while an ever increasing percentage of men may yield to the inevitable, and abandon all thoughts of extra-matrimonial relations. Such women, however, would not be looked on as outcasts, but would have a clearly recognized function in social life. This theory, however, is not one which commends itself as containing a large element of probability.

It is unfortunate that Dr. Jacobi falls into the common error of confounding free love with promiscuity. The two conceptions are as opposite as the poles. The very essence of free love is discrimination, which promiscuity specifically denies. Nor does free love necessarily negative monogamy. On the contrary, a voluntary and often lifelong monogamy is extremely common in actual free love circles. The radical conception is neither monogamic nor anti-monogamic. It is simply voluntaristic. It denies the exemption of the department of sex from the universal principle that evolution results from variation and experimentation.

Whether the ultimate ideal shall consist for the average individual of a single love, several coördinate loves, a central love with several subordinate attractions or of all these, depending on the temperament of the particular person, it does not presume to say. Much can be said for each con-

ception from a theoretic standpoint. What is important is not to discount the future, nor to compel the entire human race to stretch itself on a Procrustean bed of Mrs. Grundy's workmanship. The notion that all ideals save what may chance to be our own are vile, and that those who espouse and act according to them are degraded, sinful or degenerate, must be abandoned. Unsanctioned sex relationship has never, *merely because unsanctioned,* involved real and necessary degeneration for either participant. The mental attitude of one or both, surrounding circumstances or the expressed disapproval of others, especially when manifested by direct persecution, fully account for any real demoralization resulting. If we cannot take a large and calm view, which recognizes this fact, we shall never approach a solution of the problem.

The question of the general social consequences of this or that standard of sex

relationship is purely one of fact, to be ascertained, like any other fact, by scientific methods, stripped of preconceptions, and based on the study of actual experiments under normal conditions. Just as among all persons of decent intelligence it is fully recognized that nature places no stigma on "illegitimacy," and that "bastardy" is no ground whatever for reproach, so must the real student of sexual phenomena dismiss from his mind all thought of a necessary connection between extra-marital sex relationship and criminality.

Hysterical sentimentalists and bigoted religious dogmatists have too long assumed to speak with wholly unwarranted authority on the subject of sex, concerning which they are by all scientific principles the least qualified of all persons to speak at all. They must now give way to the scientific investigator and the quietly reasoning sociologist.

SEX MORALITY, PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE:

OR

MONOGAMY VS. VARIETY

EDWIN C. WALKER

SEX MORALITY
PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

DOCTOR JACOBI'S essay is so admirable in so many ways, is so frank and so candid and so informed by the scientific spirit, that at the outset the possible critic is denied the spur of outraged feelings; he may not draw from the "deeper sources," whose waves, we are assured, sweep over and swamp the frail craft of human reason. He must argue, he must use logic, he must "preach," if he is to reach the ear of the reasoning and ethical human being. No doubt the greater part of the intellectual force he expends, as was the greater part of the intellectual force of millions before him, is ineffective in so far as tangible changes in human customs and institutions are concerned, and this for two reasons: On the one hand, the errors in the arguing

and the preaching; and, on the other, the inability of most hearers and readers to comprehend a statement of scientific facts and a logical argument made. Nevertheless, even as Dr. Jacobi, thinking men and women will continue to interpret non-human and human facts, will continue to argue for their interpretations, will continue to advocate personal reforms and social changes that seem to be in harmony with those interpretations—in short, will continue to reason the best they can, will strive to place wiser and better guiding hands on the levers of the on-rushing engine of human emotions. Because from the "deeper sources" is lifted the curious and unreasoning mob that blocks the street against the firemen is no reason why the disciplined and cool-headed police should not clear the street and establish the fire-lines—on the contrary, it is because of this very ebullience of the primitive emotions that the police must be there and

must establish and maintain the fire-lines.

Speaking of war, it is remarked that "if lives are sacrificed, the profoundest sympathies must be enlisted in the cause." The historical fact is that the hireling soldier and the conscripted soldier have appeared on the field even more often than has the fanatical volunteer, and neither hireling nor conscript was moved by sympathy for "the cause." With the hireling, it was a matter of cold calculation or the love of adventure; the conscript had no choice.

Even Dr. Jacobi admits the part played by intellect, by teaching and precept, in creating or directing those very emotions and sentiments which he argues are dominant, particularly in the field of sex-action. Speaking of "the controversy waged around the sex-problem," he says, "here, especially, is opinion and behavior based on powerful emotions and sentiments, the *products* of heredity, education,

race, and creed." I italicize "products." Two of the four factors he names as having created present opinion and conduct in sex-life, viz., "education" and "creed," are of the domain of thought. If education and creeds (precepts, dicta), in the past have helped form the body of emotions and sentiments which to-day aid in shaping our opinions and modifying our actions in matters sexual, are we not encouraged to hope and believe that the education which we in these later generations are imparting and the precepts that we are repeating will in turn have appreciable effect in forming the body of emotions and sentiments of the future? I am sure that Dr. Jacobi so thinks, or he would not have taken the trouble to prepare this excellent paper. "To tell the simple truth," he says, "these advocates have their emotions enlisted in behalf of the double standard thru heredity and upbringing," thus again assigning to education ("up-

bringing") a creative rôle, as regards emotions and feelings. So, also in the quotation from Lecky which he italicizes— "much of our feeling on these subjects is due to laws and moral systems which were formed by men."

The cruel persecutions in all ages, some of which are instanced by Dr. Jacobi, and which sympathetic emotions were unable to prevent, were due to the acceptance of false premises or to illogical reasoning from sound premises, and hence prove not the weakness of reason, *per se,* as against emotion, but the strength of reason even when faulty in origin and process and directed to anti-social ends. In other words, beliefs not founded in fact and reasoning which was erroneous in premise or method or both perverted the normally kindly emotions of men and women or served as the tools of their cruel and vindictive creeds.

When we speak of the inequitable treat-

ment of women having its root in "primitive emotions," might it not be judicious to ask *how* primitive those emotions are supposed to be and whether the blame is not less to be laid at the door of primitive emotions than at the door of primitive reasoning, which was theological reasoning? Did not the matriarchate antedate the patriarchate, and so may we not claim that, if emotion was the active factor in the about-face, the more primitive emotions were not so unfavorable to woman as were the later? Or, was it a change in feeling or a change in the mental outlook, primarily, the shift of the theological direction of worship, that chiefly was responsible for the later degradation of women? When Earth was the Mother, sex was cleanly worshipped and woman seems to have been equal with man or paramount to him. But when the Sun took the place of chief god and the male Christ successively ascended the throne in

this or that land, the old order changed to the new and women descended in the scale of importance. Only in the Church of Rome does there linger an element of the old régime in the form of the Virgin, still worshipped as the mother of the male god. By so much only is Rome nearer to the period of the matriarchate than is Wittenberg or Geneva.

The failure of the attack of the Greek and Roman writers and of the Christian Fathers upon the double standard, does not, as Dr. Jacobi thinks it should, "astonish those who put their faith (partly) in preaching." For two reasons: First, it has not been, at bottom, a fight between logic and emotion but between two forms of logic. On the one side were the teachings of a more primitive theology, impressed almost indelibly on the race in one of the most plastic stages of its existence and drilled into the children of the later ages in the most receptive period of their

individual lives. On the other side were the secular teachings, the appeals for human justice, made by a few exceptional men. Precisely so in the special domain of religion—the comparatively few Freethinkers have had, and now have, to fight with the weapons of a better reasoning against all the inculcations of thousands of years, the parent-taught, church-taught, State-taught reiterated casuistries and dogmas that each generation has had and still has to learn.

Second, the proponents of the single standard have been handicapped from the beginning of the race by the needless burden they took upon themselves. They essayed the impossible task of bringing all men into and holding them in the narrow groove of monogamy. They tried to bring all men down to the level of abnegation and dwarfing to which all women had been condemned, by men and by women. The very opposite course is the

one indicated to every thoughtful student of human nature who is sufficiently emancipated from the thraldom of ancient theology to search for facts without bias and to face them without flinching. The advocates of a certain theory of sexual relations have had, and have, so little faith in the soundness of their theory, so little faith in the strength of any system founded upon it, so little faith in its ability to win out over all rivals in the arena of a fair test, that they have done all they could, and still do all they can, to prevent the free evolution of the family, by penalizing all divergent theories and practices, at the same time admitting that prostitution and venereal diseases are gigantic evils with which they struggle hopelessly.

"While these savages attach so little importance to the purity of their women," etc. In what does the "purity" of woman consist? With us, the word means conformity to the standards we have set up

for women. If the women of these tribes conformed to their standards, each one to that of her tribe, were they not "pure," measured by those standards? Then did not these savages attach just as much importance to the "purity" of their women as we do to that of ours? Did they not, do not the survivors now, punish departures from their standards just as rigorously, to say the least, as we do departures from ours? The truth is, we are trying to test their conceptions of purity by the conventional social acids with which we test our own. But when we rise above conventions and seek the essentials of sexual purity, we are sure to discover that very often our claims are as unfounded as many of theirs would be seen to be could they be brought to formulate them in the terms of our psychology. If we define "pure" sexual relations as the unbought, unsold, associations of a man and a woman who love each other—and how else could

any rational, self-respecting, ethical man or women define them —we are shocked to realize how much sexual impurity there is in nominally monogamic lands; and so great a proportion of it sheltered under the sacred roof-trees of monogamic homes.

Lecky's famous paragraph always has seemed to me very suggestive of implications that he did not perceive. "On that one ignoble and degraded form (the prostitute's) are concentrated the passions that might have filled the world with shame." But is not the world filled with shame as it is? Is not prostitution itself a shame and a reproach to civilization? And what shall we say of the homes it has *not* saved, of the homes into which from its altars have been carried the horrors of venereal disease, bringing the aftermath of wrecked and shamed wives and blinded children? Paraphrasing Lecky, the prostitute, "herself the supreme type of vice," "is ultimately the efficient" excuse of the popular

moralist in refusing to look the sexual problem squarely in the face.

"Action is ever followed by reaction. After centuries of extreme discrimination against women in matters of individual liberty, we are now witnessing a return swing of the pendulum, which threatens to carry us to the opposite extreme of unlimited license," says Dr. Jacobi.

But there are two reactions, and the one not named is the really retrogressive one. The reaction from the restriction of woman's liberty in the past to the restriction of man's liberty in the present and future is proceeding swiftly and widely in sentiment and far from negligibly in law. It is not at all strange that with few exceptions the most active workers in ascetic "moral reforms," usually wrongly called moral and reforms, are middle-aged and old men and women, probably never overly strong in observation and ratiocination, and who now have well-equipped

forgetteries. What they do not wish or need now they are quite sure they never needed or wished, or, if they did wish it, the desire was an evidence of their then unregenerate state; and they are positive they are doing righteous work when they force all others, regardless of the wishes and needs of the others, to conform to the present standards of the atrophied censors. In a new direction, in the misused name of science, they are blithely demanding the enactment of laws about the ultimate effects of which they are in total ignorance, because, if for no other reason, there is such an entangled mass of causes that not even the most earnest and thoro student of science is prepared to hazard positive assertions, much less to take any but the most cautious and tentative steps in social experimentation. But the aged and forgetful panaceists rush heedlessly along, having little difficulty in finding legislators as ignorant and irresponsible as

themselves to abet them in their reckless and irremediable tinkering.

It is a mistake to say that "all are agreed that the driving power behind women who join the ranks of prostitutes is the most extreme poverty" if by that it is meant that poverty is the driving power behind *all* women who become prostitutes. The same temperament and lack of delicate sensibility and a high ethical standard that lead so many men to buy the counterfeit of love are operative in inducing many women to sell the counterfeit of love. This is proved beyond the possibility of successful dispute by the fact that in all historical ages, as now, very many women entered into loveless marriage relations, not, as some did, of course, for the bare necessities of a poor home, but that they might thereby enjoy the luxuries and social position they could not otherwise obtain or otherwise obtain with so little labor. The psychology that leads some women to

thus prostitute themselves within the marriage pale indubitably leads others to prostitute themselves without that pale.

A not inconsiderable contingent is recruited among young girls who have made a "misstep" and against whom in consequence a besotted and cowardly public opinion has shut the door of hope.

Others frankly go out from the light of social respectability because only outside can they find freedom in the gratification of the imperious desires which they share with their brother men.

Still others, inexperienced in and impatient of life they regard as "dull" and "prosy" or as too laborious, go to the underworld for the care-freeness, the gayety and frivolity, which they delude themselves or have been deluded into thinking they will find there without countervailing vexations and sorrows.

Some have descended to where they are

because indulgence in alcoholic stimulants and in narcotics robbed them of self-control and so of self-respect, and some have taken their departure from the hells of unhappy marriage.

For, after all, despite the guess of the economic panaceists, prostitution is not an exception to the rule that every effect has many causes, near and remote, direct and contributory. The inevitable corollary is that no remedy is a cure-all.

To all the prophesiers of the ultimate triumph of the monogamic ideal, even to the author himself, I would earnestly commend this most trenchant paragraph of Dr. Jacobi's essay:

"Nowhere else is causation so complex and so elusive as in the phenomena constituting social science. Even the immediate effects of present causes can be outlined dimly and with great difficulty; the remote effects are beyond computation. This obstacle, however, does not deter our

self-styled prophets. Seizing some factor now prominent in its influence, they proceed to construct a definite future upon the basis of its present action, as if any cause will go on producing its effects for all time, without being crossed and recrossed by thousands of other causes working out their thousands of effects. It is assumed that one thing will change while others will remain unchanged."

No one can see to-day what will be the effect upon monogamy of the free play of individual and social forces for the next hundred or thousand years. What modifications may not be wrought by the political and industrial readjustments of woman's sphere, by the advent of really free divorce, by the intelligent control of conception, by the differentiating work of group marriage, of polygamy, of polyandry, of trial marriage, of frank variety among self-supporting free men and women, by the progress of medical science

and sane sociology in limiting or extirpating venereal disease?

Lecky had the faculty, not so rare as it should be, of expressing his thought in such a way that the reader, unless he critically examines the assertion, gets the impression of having been told something that is indisputable. Dr. Jacobi remarks that the utilitarian arguments in favor of monogamy are summed up by Lecky in three sentences: "Nature, by making the number of males and females nearly equal, indicates it as natural. In no other form of marriage can the government of the family be so happily sustained. In no other does woman assume the position of the equal of man."

The approximately equal numbers of the two sexes proves nothing for monogamy that it does not prove for a group marriage, with the advantage for the latter that the despair of bereavement is mitigated and orphanage prevented. It

proves nothing for monogamy that it does not prove for a system of variety wherein the sexes are equal in freedom and responsibility.

Taking the other two statements together, by what process of self-bewildering could Lecky have induced himself to hazard such assertions? When he wrote, the now swiftly hastening movement for the recognition of the equality of woman with man, within marriage and out, hardly had more than fairly begun. The wife did not "assume the position of the equal of" her husband. He was the single absolute head of the family, as he is often to-day; the wife was not his equal in any respect, whether in the special domain of sex, the ownership and control of property, or the possession and training of the children. The property she made or inherited was not hers; the letters she received were not hers; the children she bore were not hers if, under no matter what

grievous provocation, she separated from her husband. She was not an entity in the eyes of the law. Her body was not hers—how short a time it is since in England an action would lie for the legal "restitution of the marital rights" of her husband!

The "government of the family" was "happily sustained" by the legal and, if he felt so disposed, the actual, tsar, the husband. If, as of course often happened, the wife was the stronger of the two and so ruled *de facto* in the household, she could not rule *de jure*, and she was not his equal in the broader social view of the situation. If to-day there is legal and practical equality of rights in many monogamic homes, the change has been wrought by vast outside political, economic, and ethical agitations and revolutions, identical with or related to those that Dr. Jacobi has shown us are operating to abolish the double standard. There

is little if any evidence that the monogamic home, as such, has been a positive factor in bringing about its own improvement or transformation. Negatively, it has had this effect, for it has been one of the most conspicuous of the terrible examples of the inequality of rights of the sexes which have stirred thinking, conscientious men and women into action for society-wide reform.

Even if he had been as right as he was wrong in asserting that in monogamy woman assumed "the position of the equal of man," he was not in a position to know what we know, now, that such equality has come to women and men in love relations other than monogamic, and is now so coming to ever-increasing numbers of them.

We have been warned repeatedly against the hazards of prophesying, and I agree that it is a temerous proceeding, but as Spencer has been permitted to say that "The monogamic form of the sexual

relation is manifestly the ultimate form; and any change to be anticipated must be in the direction of completion and extension of it," perhaps I may be pardoned for declaring that this assumption is not warranted by the results of the study, up to this time, of human psychology and sociology; that, in fact, just the opposite conclusion is indicated. By Spencer's own doctrine, development is from the simple to the complex, from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, and I see no reason why the relations of human sexes should be the one exception to the rule, why ultimately all men and women should voluntarily enter into one form of sexual relationship and all find therein for the whole of their lives the greatest possible physical, moral, and emotional health. But there is not space here for me to go into this phase of the general subject in detail; and that has been done elsewhere, by others and by myself.

If it be true that human passion is diminishing as civilization advances, instead of merely modifying the forms of its manifestation, and limiting its "natural" results, then it needs no power of divination to foretell the dying out of the race if this diminution continues without check. But if the outbreaks of passion are less frequent and less violent because the emotions are being brought more and more under the control of the intellectual and ethical faculties, then the outlook is most hopeful for an improving humanity so long as the earth continues to be fairly habitable. Quite likely the truth lies somewhere between the two hypotheses.

The order of development in point of time puts the emotions before the intellect and ethics latest in the series. But this order of appearance does not justify us in classing them as low, and higher, and highest, morally. *Per se,* they are equally immoral, non-moral, or moral, as

you choose your term. Body, emotions, mind, ethics—all are absolutely essential; there is no full man or woman otherwise. When you rate the body as "low" or list the sexual desires as "lower instincts" you in effect say that the trunk of the human tree is rotten *ab initio*, and yet you expect healthy branches of "higher faculties" to spring therefrom! It is the *use* that is "low" or "higher" or "highest." Muscle is not in itself "low," tho muscle may be used in the commission of an anti-social act. The sexual organs are not in themselves "low," tho their injudicious or reckless use may bring to pass anti-social results. The intellect is reckoned among the "higher faculties," tho misused intellects have planned and executed the most colossal crimes against society and its component units. Ethics is "high," yet untimely or misapplied morals have precipitated immense social disasters. The good and the evil alike are in the use. The

foundation is not low or impure because it is first in order of time and is nearer to the ground than is the superstructure, the tower, or the dome.

SEX MORALITY:

A PLEA FOR SEXUAL CONTINENCE IN THE UNMARRIED

JAMES P. WARBASSE, M.D.

SEX MORALITY—AN ARGUMENT IN DEFENCE OF THE SINGLE STANDARD OF SEXUAL MORALS.

THERE is much speculation, if not much discussion, upon the prevalent double standard of sexual morals and the effects of continence upon continent individuals.

What is sexual continence? The general interpretation applied to this term is that it means abstinence from coitus, especially in an individual capable of performing such an act. This, I think, is an utterly wrong interpretation. Physiologically and socially, sexual continence means abstinence from those stimuli, received thru all the senses and engendered in the mind, which result in libidinous turgescence of the organs of copulation.

There is an unscientific tendency to take out of the sexual functions the act of copulation and treat it as an isolated entity. As a matter of fact, it is but one link in a chain of sexual phenomena. This understanding is important because many persons are misled by the conventional definition, and often do themselves physical harm. A young man and woman who repeatedly indulge themselves in amorous caresses to the point of creating a high degree of sexual excitement, and then part without coitus, may regard themselves as continent, but in the light of physiology and pathology they are neither continent nor wise. The continence which they have respected is a fetish. The greater should not be confused with the lesser. The man who drinks brandy and soda, with the idea of going as far as he can, is not slaking his thirst, he is getting drunk. Sexual continence is not compatible with sexual excitement.

This whole question of sexual love has been confused by breaking it up into sections. The great and fundamental sexual joys, inherent in communion with an object of love, by thought, word, look, or touch, stimulating with rapture the higher centers, and infusing the mind with gratification, are all a part of the sexual chain, altho no libidinous impulses arise. Very easily from one state may the stimulations pass on to the next, the next, and the next, until the great sexual act is complete, and a babe lies nestled at its mother's breast. To start the chain of impulses means that the end is already in sight. To interrupt the process of sexual love is fraught with a sense of incompleteness, with dissatisfaction, and often with danger. Continence is abstinence from sexual love and its greater stimuli.

The next definition which we should attempt is that of "single standard" and

"double standard." By the first, it is understood that certain sexual practices which are morally justifiable for one sex are morally justifiable for the other sex. In the terms of our western civilization, it is the male sex which is understood to be permitted the privileges which are denied the female. In some of the older civilizations the female enjoyed the greater privileges. It is my own opinion that there should be no privileged sex or class. The sexual morality which governs the woman should be the same as that which governs the man. Privilege in sex, society, or industry, is pernicious. There is no such a thing as one class having privileges or advantages unless there is another class of whom advantage is taken. True democracy is sex-wide as well as class-wide.

From a scientific point of view, this belief is made tenable because, I think, the harm of an incomplete sexual life is vis-

ited upon both the man and the woman—equally, let us say, tho the peculiarities of the two sexes make comparison impossible. Much is said of the libido sexualis developing earlier and being stronger in the male, but we have no conclusive information. We do only know that the male is more subjected to artificial stimulation; but if a boy and girl grew up alone in an atmosphere free from such influences, it is conceivable that their impulses would be similar. The same may be said of the sexual impulses of men; they are unduly stimulated by the artificial social conditions with which they are surrounded. If the habits, privileges, ideals, and conceptions of life among women were the same as among men, society would be overwhelmed with sexual promiscuity, for it is conceivable that women would become in their sexual habits similar to men.

In this temperate zone puberty begins

in the male at from ten to fourteen years and in the female at from eleven to fourteen. There is not much difference between the two sexes in this respect; the slightly earlier period in the male may be due to environmental influences.

The term "sexual morality" is also much employed. In discussing this subject, morality should not be separated from the scientific viewpoint. There is a tendency to separate them, as tho science had no business with morality. It has. The mistake which society has always made has been to relegate the science of morals to an especially unscientific class. This subject cannot be discussed apart from morality. Society has too long made the mistake to think of morals as something esoteric and immaterial. It is my view that morality without a physical basis is not morality at all. There is no such thing as spiritual morality. If sex-

ual practices, marital or extra-marital, do not cause harm to any individual, alive or yet unborn, those practices are not immoral. No man can harm any extra-natural omnipotence. Immorality consists in harming people; and that means one's self as well as others. This is decidedly a question inseparable from morals.

Let us consider the physiology of the sex organs in their relation to continence. The mistake should not be made to think of the sexual organs as dormant excepting at a certain period in life. They begin to functionate before the child is born, and continue thruout life. The internal secretions of these organs, circulating in the blood, influence all the cells of the body. They modify the shape, growth, and texture of other structures, powerfully influence the central nerve cells, and are potent factors in stamping the individual with character. Sigmund Freud, in

"Infantile Sexuality" ("Three contributions to the Sexual Theory,") describes the early signs of sexuality. The earliness of their beginning cannot be identified. At the other end of life they are illustrated by the reply of the aged French savant, who, upon being asked, "When does a man cease to love?" replied, "You must ask some one older than I."

Sexuality and sexual impulses begin and end with life. Nor should the mistake be made to think of the pelvic organs as constituting the whole sexual system. The internal secretions which have a strong influence upon sexual character come not only from the ovaries, testicles, uterus, and prostate, but also from the thyroid, and, perhaps, from the hypophysis, suprarenals, parathyroids, thymus, and other organs of which little is known. Sexuality is general, not local; and, properly speaking, the sexual organs are all

the organs of the body. The fact that there are certain highly specialized parts, and that there are superficial areas which are especially sensitive to erogenous impulses, has given these regions special sexual significance, while but little is known of the other organs as sexual centers. I desire to bring out the fact that the sexual organs are constantly in action, and that repression is both impossible and undesirable.

External sexual excitements have the power to cause a precocious or premature development of the sexual activities in both boys and girls, just as intellectual excitements or stimuli have the power to heighten the intellectual functions. Excessive, continuous, or prolonged stimulation of the erogenous zones results in exaggeration, or later exhaustion, of the libidinous impulses. Testicular fluid in the seminal vesicles, under unexciting conditions, does not require to be dis-

charged at intervals. I have not been able to find in the studies of the physiologists that its retention is abnormal or unhygienic. I do not believe it is.

The ejaculation of this fluid takes place as a result of erogenous excitement or local stimulation. Involuntary emissions, masturbation, or coitus empty the vesicles; but without some preliminary causative influence ejaculation does not take place. The dogmatic statement is sometimes made that these emissions are necessary for the health of the man. This contention is not substantiated. The idea is kept alive by those who wish to believe it in order to justify their own practices, by those who perpetuate a tradition, and by those who actually regard it as a scientific fact. I do not believe that continence is injurious to the male, provided that his continence is real.

The common mistake is to think of coitus as synonymous with incontinence.

I have tried to show the difference. It is undoubtedly true that idle men, living under the abnormal and unhealthful conditions of city life, lending themselves to erotic stimuli of great variety, thinking lustfully of women, and rolling their eyes about for libidinous suggestions, are promoted in health by completing the sexual act which they always have in process of beginning. It is not coitus that preserves their health; it is the preliminary vicious habits that are damaging it. Coitus is called upon as the remedy. Having begun the sexual act, it is normal that it should be completed.

But the healthy man, whose mind is occupied with wholesome thoughts, who has interests and activities for the working hours and enough knowledge and intellect to make relaxation a joy—such a man does not suffer from mere lack of coitus. The vacant mind, ennui, tobacco, alcohol, and other promoters of defective oxida-

tion are often the precursors of the sexual necessity.

An unmarried young man of the above described healthy type, who argues that some day he shall marry, who thinks that somewhere in the world the woman is waiting for him, who does not harbor the delusion of the sexual necessity, who has resolved that he shall expect virginity of his bride and that she may expect the same of him, who is aware of the harm and dangers of extra-marital coitus, and who, having thus fortified himself, dismisses from his mind the whole question as settled for him—such a man has clear sailing. The fellow who gets in trouble is the weak man, who vacillates, who entertains erogenous thoughts with himself as a party, and who goes half way and attempts to recede—he has no business with the single standard of sexual morals; it will make a fool of him. Dalliance is not abstinence.

I do not conceive of a man suffering from the ills of continence or growing impotent who has been cast away on a desert island, with no immediate prospect of relief, and whose mind and hands are occupied with raising grain, catching fish for subsistence, and constructing a boat for escape.

Examinations of many unmarried men show congestion of the prostate and prostatic urethra, due to just these uncompleted sexual activities. The continuance of the sexual excitements without completing the sexual act perpetuates the congestion, until in the course of time impotence supervenes. What is the remedy? Removal of the cause, ceasing from sexual excitements which cannot be completed. The remedy is not taking another step, fraught even with greater possibilities of harm and danger. I have elsewhere (*Medical Sociology,* p. 83) set down the objections to extra-marital sex-

ual intercourse, which are sufficiently pertinent to this discussion to be reproduced.

"The dangers and objections arising from violation of the rule, that a man should have sexual intercourse with none but his wife and that if he have no wife he shall remain continent, are as follows: the moral and social degradation of a woman who otherwise would live rightly; the danger of causing disease in such a woman; the encouragement, by example, of a practice which stands preeminent as the great cause of social unhappiness, the subtraction of just so much joy and devotion from the woman who should or will stand in the proper relation of wife; the possibility of the propagation of illegitimate children; the strong probability of contracting venereal disease; the danger of transmitting physical or moral blight to one's offspring; the development of vicious habits; the cultivation of immoral society; the wasting of

time and energy in unprofitable company; the social harm to one's self and family; the moral harm which springs from acting in secretiveness and shame; the contracting of the concomitant vices which go hand in hand with venery for venery's sake; and the postponement of the organization, or the weakening of the strength, of the most potent factor in the solidarity of society—the home."

These are strong reasons against extramarital sexual congress, and each is susceptible of serious consideration.

Congestion of the deep urethra is found also in the incontinent as well as in the continent. Excessive coitus is said by good authorities to be a common cause of physical deterioration. Is it not possible that the individuals who need coitus as the remedy for their ills are the same as those who later suffer from the harm of excess? And is it not possible that, single or married, they will permit their sexual im-

pulses to do them injury? The pity is that a woman has to be dragged down with them.

To concede that coitus is essential for the health of unmarried men is to concede the desirability of a chain of social conditions which are the concomitants of the concession. Who shall be the woman to preserve his precious health? He would prefer a comely young woman for seduction, but suppose we grant him the prostitute? That means regulation of prostitution. Regulation of prostitution means legal approval of the double standard of sexual morals, the increase of the proportion of unmarried men and therefore of unmarried women, and the diminution in the ratio of homes to population. I am opposed to the legalization of prostitution.

All that has been said of men may be said of women. They are harmed quite as much as men by empty minds, ennui,

idleness, and erotic suggestions. Such women create their own internal stimuli. They long for love. The unsatisfied longing inflicts constitutional damage. As men become hypochondriac and impotent, so do women become neurotic and sallow,—all from the uncompleted stimuli of sexual love.

The true remedy in both cases is normal social love and marriage. If it cannot be had, the next best thing is the elimination of the sexual stimuli or supplanting them with less erogenous impulses. Given, a woman capable of sexual love and its highest gratifications, deny her these things, and she may be preserved in usefulness and happiness if she but become engrossed in occupation. On every hand we see women who exemplify both types.

This discussion is made necessary because of the bad social conditions in which we live. The remedy is an economic one.

When an equable distribution of the proceeds of his labor goes to the worker, and there is no bonus for the maintenance of an idle class, when a true social democracy is secured, then the relations of men and women may be adjusted in harmony with the highest possibilities of sexual morals,—and not until then.

SEX MORALITY,

IS THERE ANY JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALITY IN THE SEXES?

B. S. TALMEY, M.D.

IS THERE ANY JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALITY IN THE SEXES?

THE history of sexual morality, which is really the history of the evolution of marriage, shows that every advanced step in the development of marriage was made in the interest of the race.

1st Stage: If we take Morgan's "Ancient Society" as the basis of our inquiry we find that in the lowest conceivable stage of savagery, men living in hordes, mankind lived in a state of promiscuous intercourse like the gregarious animals.

2nd Stage: From this irregular state the consanguineous family develops. It is founded upon intermarriage of brothers and sisters in a group, but marriage

between parents and children is now prohibited.

3rd Stage: Experience having taught even these primitive men that the offspring of such marriages is often in some respect deficient and sickly, the next step was the prohibition of intermarriage in the same tribe. This prohibition had the effect to exclude own brothers and sisters from the marriage relation. This so-called Punaluan family was founded upon inter-marriage of several sisters, from one tribe, with each others' husbands in a group, the joint husbands not being necessarily kinsmen of each other, but belonging to other tribes than their wives, or of several brothers with each others' wives in a group. In this so-called exogamous marriage each group of men were conjointly married to the group of women. The children naturally know only their mother, and inheritance follows in the female line. The common mother

of the tribe is the origin and ruler of the same.

4th Stage: The next step is the pairing family. Communal marriage is replaced by individual marriage. It was founded upon marriage between single pairs, but without an exclusive cohabitation. The marriage continued during the pleasure of the parties. Marriage between any relatives is entirely prohibited, consequently marriage in a group is impossible. The male leaves his tribe and marries into another tribe. The children know now their father also. Yet they still belong to their mother's tribe. The fortune of the tribe belongs to the ancestress. Matriarchate prevails. Woman is yet the undisputed mistress of the house and clan. The males have only to provide the clan with food and all the other conveniences of life from day to day. They have no other authority. The husband being subject to his wife, property and descent go

in the female line. Kinship is counted thru the mother. When a man dies his arms and dress, his only personal property, are handed over to the tribe to which he formerly belonged. The main fortune remains in the clan of the female.

5th Stage: With the training of animals and the breeding of herds, sources of wealth hitherto unthought of develop. Now, the males have always been the providers and possessors of the food supply of the clan, and the herds being now the main source of food they consequently belong to the males. Lest with the death of the father the flocks should be handed over to his former clan, change of descent from the female line to the male line is now established. The man is now the ruler. He is the head of the clan, manager of its possessions and leader in war. Hitherto lands and herds belonged in common to the entire clan or even tribe. But in the frequent wars, at this period in

human history, powerful leaders were necessary, and the latter became preeminent among the other members of the tribe. As a reward they often receive individual allotments from the common property of the tribe. These allotments ripen finally into individual ownership to be inherited by the children. Now inheritance in the male line requires that the father should know his children. He exacts, therefore, strict fidelity from his wife. This leads to the patriarchal family of the Bible. It is founded upon the marriage of one man with one or several wives.

Thus we see that the changes in the marriage relations of the sexes were all made in the interest of the welfare of the offspring. Promiscuity, consanguineous marriage, punaluan family and the pairing family followed each other in the interest of the health of posterity. The last change into female monogamy was made

in the economic interest of the progeny.

The husband in sacrificing his own comfort while providing food and shelter for his children must be certain that he is the father of these children. Uncertainty would make him negligent, and the existence of the race would be jeopardized.

Adultery on the part of the husband does not necessarily alter the relations of the children to the parents and to each other. The husband misconducts himself outside the family circle, inchastity of the wife either altogether breaks the family bond or weakens it thru doubt. The purity of the woman and her faithfulness are, therefore, of the greatest racial importance, and it is eminently proper that she should be in the van of moral progress. The highest moral character, says Kant, is that which does the good not out of inclination but from a sense of duty guided by reason, and there is a good reason for female chastity. The masculine morality

is as yet very little influenced by reason, hence the male standard of chastity is still very low, so much so that, with meretricious venery rampant, male monogamy is as yet a dream of the idealist.

But is there no reason why the man should be as chaste as the woman? The answer must be, Yes! There is a valid reason why he should not be inferior to her in the standard of chastity. If there was, perhaps, no racial reason for his chastity in ancient times, there is a good reason for him to be chaste since the arrival of venereal diseases in Europe with Columbus' soldiers. Nowadays the racial interest requires from him the same strict chastity as from the woman.

The dangers of promiscuous intercourse thru the venereal diseases cannot be overstated. Noeggerath * claimed that, in

* The Editor verily believes that it is about time to give your old Dr. Noeggerath, who has been dead so many years, a rest. *Requiescat in pace* and let us take more modern investigators.

New York City, of 1000 men 800 have had gonorrhea, 90 per cent. of all these men have not been thoroly cured and can infect their wives if they ever get married. As a result three out of every five married women in New York are more or less infected with gonorrhea. Eighty per cent. of the deaths from inflammatory diseases peculiar to women, 75 per cent. of all special surgical operations performed on women and 60 per cent. of all the work done by specialists in diseases of women are the result of this disgusting disease.

Gonorrheal infection may make a tragedy of married life by destroying the woman's conceptional capacity and rendering her irrevocably childless. Fifty per cent. or more of all the infected women are rendered absolutely and irremediably sterile. In addition many are condemned to a life-long invalidism. The aspirations centered in mother-

hood and children are thus swept away.

Besides mutilating the innocent women gonorrhea destroys the eyesight of innocent babies. From 70 to 80 per cent. of the ophthalmia which blots out the eyes of babies, and 15 to 25 per cent. of all blindness is caused by this disease. And these things are even more tragic because the majority of infections is conveyed from chronic gonorrhea without the intention or even the knowledge of the offender.

The other most appalling venereal disease is syphilis. It may become the cause of all maladies humanity is afflicted with. In gonorrheal infection the individual risks the wife has to incur are much more serious than those following syphilis. But the constitutional disturbances caused by syphilis and the risks to the offspring make this disease one of the most dreaded affections known to medical science.

The prevalence of syphilis is estimated at 18 per cent. of the adult population. Some claim that in the large cities, in the better class of families, one-third of the sons of adult age are infected with syphilis. The disease causes 40 per cent. of all miscarriages, and the mortality of syphilitic children is about 60 per cent. Syphilis is the only disease transmitted to the offspring in full virulence. Sixty to eighty per cent. of all infected children die before they are born.

Syphilis is a chronic disease, the duration of which is unlimited. It may remain latent for several years and then break out.

Thus the dangers of venereal diseases beset not only the individual but thru the individual the entire race. With these dangers staring at him, no young man should even think of exposing himself, his future wife and offspring to all these risks for the mere pittance of a short mo-

mentary enjoyment in the company of pestiferous individuals. It is a moral crime to impart these loathsome diseases to one's wife and children.

Hence, if strict female chastity was originally demanded in the interest of posterity on account of the changed law of inheritance, in our present age of syphilis and gonorrhea the interest of posterity requires the same strict chastity in the man.

There is, therefore, no valid reason for the present double standard of morality of the sexes.

SEX MORALITY—ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW

By Maude Glasgow, M. D.

SEX MORALITY—ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW

DR. W. J. ROBINSON'S article on Sexual Morality very aptly illustrates his claim—that individual bias creates influences and controls personal opinion. After reading his article, there is no doubt left that this is so. His enthusiastic support of sexual immorality would indicate a moral myopia where sex questions are concerned, which limits his vision, and forces him to see objects out of their proper proportions.

From no point of view can the mere gratification of the senses be regarded as admirable, useful, beneficial or praiseworthy, and such gratification, we know, savors rather of weakness and selfishness. The sex impulse is but a means to an end,

and the supreme object of marriage is the child, and not such sense gratification.

If this sex impulse did not exist, the burden of bearing and rearing a family might have been avoided, so its existence fulfils a wise purpose, but when this function, thru its intemperate use, becomes the means by which misery, disease, and death are introduced into homes and families, when it becomes a force to deteriorate and decimate the race, then it is time to put the brakes on, and regulate the balance-wheel in order to regain normal proportions.

It would be well to have a correct definition of the terms "strong sexuality," and "powerful sexuality," with which the article is seasoned. A powerful sexuality, overmastering in demand, and brooking no denial is the type met in the pervert, the idiot, the imbecile, who are as indecent as they are dangerous. The man low-down in the scale of civilization has

also a "strong" and a "powerful" sexuality, because he is a little nearer his four-footed progenitors, than his civilized brother—when the latter is normal.

It is the strong and virile man who controls his appetites—he masters them, but the weakling, whose lascivious thoughts keep him in a constant state of irritation, becomes the slave of his.

Sexual intemperance, as a recent writer has stated, is a habit, slowly acquired thru long generations, fostered by false and pernicious traditions, and the absence of punishment for the aggressor.

We are now learning that the imperiousness of the sex instinct has been greatly overrated, and that the evils of temperance are more or less imaginary. Fournier has declared that he does not know what the evils of continence are, for he has never seen them, but that one-eighth of the disease and misery of the world has been due to incontinence.

It would seem that the strong sexuality displayed by a sex whose biological contribution to the germ of the race is discharged in a brief moment of enjoyment, is very greatly less than that exhibited by the party of the other part whose contribution is made thru long months of patient endurance, in the agony of parturition, and in the long months of unselfish devotion which follow. Can anyone doubt the greater power, energy, capacity of the lifegiver, the mother of the race, whose natural instincts are for the preservation and upbuilding of that race to which she has given birth? It is she whose instincts form the safest guide and not those of her mate; and it is her demands which must furnish the standard for both.

It has been said that the reality of marriage sanctifies the form. Marriage should not be a mere sexual coupling. It must include the psychic sympathy, the

intangible, emotional, invisible chains which are stronger than the Atlantic cable —while they last at any rate. So that if a man tires of his wife, which Dr. Robinson assures us some men do, and he longs for—not another wife, but some woman, any woman, in order to gratify his animalism, then both the man and his partner must coarsen and deteriorate. They have no emotional excuse; there is on the one side but sensuality, and on the other cupidity; and the man returns to the wife he expects to be faithful, reeking with the disease of the woman he embraced, and in his heart despised. He has made himself a perjurer, a hypocrite, and an adulterer. Ellen Key very truly says, "Man has as little right to satisfy desire by unchastity, as he has to satisfy hunger by theft."

As for the men who we are assured cannot live in permanent union with any woman and who like temporary changes:

well, for these there will always be some women like themselves and they can wallow in filth together, but decent women who have unfortunately mated with men of this class should obtain a divorce in order to protect their bodies from disease, and their minds from contamination.

And as for the men who have "an uncontrollably powerful sexuality," who "would like to have all restrictive laws smashed to pieces," society needs protection from this type as well as his cousins of lesser degree, and for such the operation of vasectomy, which is practically painless and not attended by danger, should be performed, and it would doubtless prove of considerable benefit to themselves, while it would also be a protection to society.

The statement that the institutions of polygamy, monogamy and polyandry were influenced by the degree of sexual power in a race or nation, polygamy in-

dicating sexual strength, monogamy moderate sexual strength, and polyandry sexual weakness, has no foundation in fact. The foundation upon which monogamy rests is that of an existing necessity for it, and this necessity is now strengthened by laws and customs. Crawley states that "Our formal marriage system is not a forcible repression of natural impulses, but merely the rigid crystallization of those natural impulses which, in a more fluid form, have been in human nature from the first." The various forms of marriage would appear to be influenced by economic conditions rather than by "sexual power."

Monogamous marriage is found to exist among birds in about 90 per cent. of cases, their unions being fairly permanent as well.

Permanent monogamous marriage occurs among anthropoid apes, and as man slowly developed from the animal state it

is probable that monogamous marriage was an inheritance and dictated by the needs of the offspring, just as it is to-day.

Polygamy at one time prevailed almost universally, and arose with the Patriarchal form of government. This institution led to a great abuse of power, the women were regarded as mere chattels, and were bought and sold like animals. Thus the word family originally meant slaves or servants. The woman by her unpaid labor helped to support the Patriarch, who then had time to devote to congenial pursuits. Because of the numerical equality of the sexes, only the wealthy and powerful males could indulge in polygamy, the other males were obliged to lead a celibate life.

Polyandry was also an economic question, tho of a different nature. The latter arose when there was a surplus of males, and not "when tribes were sexually weak." Polyandry was an adaptation to

conditions, and when a numerical equality was regained between the sexes, it disappeared.

The purpose of marriage is the continuance of the race. A sexual intemperance which murders infants born and unborn, which brings diseases and mutilation to wives, which destroys the procreative capacity in both sexes, which breaks up homes, which leads to divorce, which destroys efficiency, and shortens the expectation of life, cannot be tolerated.

The greatest good of the greatest number is the end to be kept in view, and humanity is no longer reckoned as so many men—besides women and children; the best interests of the sexes are bound up together, for Kant has said the sexes are but half of the whole and what injures one injures both.

It is almost inconceivable, that, when men have tendencies to immorality which they are bravely struggling to subdue, and

when they come to the physician for advice and help, the latter, instead of giving wise counsel, advises the man not to attempt to gain a victory over self, but to cease struggling, to be false to his marriage vows. Such a physician destroys the confidence of the public in the physician and degrades the profession to which he belongs.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR

The above article was not intended for inclusion in this Symposium on Sex Morality. It appeared in the MEDICAL REVIEW OF REVIEWS as an answer to my paper and I include it here as a good illustration of the kind of argumentation which is indulged in by the quasiscientific prudes. All they have to do is to throw at you the adjective "immoral" or "vicious," and they think they have settled the question. To discuss Dr. Glasgow's paper would be futile. But I will take the liberty to reproduce here a paragraph from an article in my Sexual Problems of To-day. The little article is entitled: "Who Should Discuss the Sexual Continence

Question?" and the paragraph referred to is as follows:

In order to reach a proper solution of the sexual continence question, we must eliminate from the discussion certain classes of people. We must eliminate the man who is so old that he no longer remembers that he ever was young; we must eliminate the impotent or pervert, who never experienced any normal desire; we must eliminate the bigoted theologian and the narrow-minded moralist, who consider extra-marital intercourse a *crime,* about on a par with burglary or murder; we must eliminate—this by all means—the asexualized old maid, who has no conception of the power of the libido in normal man (or in normal woman, for that matter); and—last but not least—we must also eliminate the debauchee who puts an absurdly exaggerated value on the sexual function, and who believes that life without sexual gratification is not worth living.

Dr. Maude Glasgow, whose sincerity nobody will question, is a typical representative of one of the above referred to classes—it is not neces-

sary to specify which—and she is therefore not competent to discuss any sexual problems.

The question should be discussed only by normal, healthy, free thinking, scientific men and women ranging in age between thirty and fifty. They may be older, provided they have good memories.

Only then will we have an *honest* and scientifically *valuable* answer to this tremendously important question: The existence or non-existence of the sexual "necessity."